

# ❖ HEBRAICA. ❖

VOL. III.

APRIL, 1887.

No. 3.

## ON THE SYNONYMS עֵרָה AND קָהָל.

BY REV. PHILIP A. NORDELL, D. D.,

New London, Conn.

A study of these words is important not merely because of their frequent occurrence and intimate relationship, but because of their reflecting the evolution of political and ecclesiastical institutions. This interest is greatly increased by the unusual difficulty experienced in drawing a well-defined line of demarcation between them. Both seem to designate popular gatherings, especially of the people of Israel. Like many other closely related synonyms, they are sometimes used in this general sense without any discernible effort on the part of the writer to discriminate between them.

The root יָעַר (to make fast, fix, or determine), which gives מוֹעֵד (a fixed time or place, and hence a fixed or predetermined gathering), gives also עֵרָה, which is often taken to be an assembly or congregation gathered at some fixed time or place. But this sense, so fundamental and conspicuous in מוֹעֵד is far less apparent in עֵרָה. It may be said, indeed, that no well-defined instance of עֵרָה being used in this sense of מוֹעֵד exists in Hebrew literature. In קָהָל the radical meaning passes from the participial form of the verb קָהָל (a calling together or summoning), to a designation of the assembly so called or summoned. Etymologically it means the *convocata societas*, and corresponds to the ἐκκλησία called together by the Greek magistrates. Still a קָהָל is not always a convocation; it may designate a spontaneous and unpremeditated gathering, as in Num. xx. 4, 6; Ezra ii. 64. An עֵרָה, on the contrary, seems in many places to partake of the nature of a קָהָל in that it is formally summoned to the place of meeting, Ex. xxxv. 20; Lev. viii. 3; Num. i. 18, etc. The etymology, therefore, cannot be relied on in determining their meanings.

Nor is the result more satisfactory if we turn to writers who have attempted to state the difference between them. Perfect agreement is found among those only who, like Bevan in Smith's *Bib. Dict.*, s. v. "Congregation," dismiss them as practically equivalent. Other writers reach the most varied and contradictory



conclusions. Prof. Plumptre in the same work, s. v. "Synagogue," following the etymology, makes the predominant idea in **ערה** that of an appointed meeting, and in **קהל** of a meeting called together. Umbreit understands a **קהל** to be any general assembly, and an **ערה**, more precisely, a representative assembly, "*senatus, Rath der Aeltesten*" (*Die Sprueche Salomo's*, 5: 14). Delitzsch on the same passage controverts the opinion that these words point respectively to the civil and ecclesiastical aspects of the Hebrew commonwealth, but is inclined to think that **קהל** denotes the "Gesammtekklesia," and **ערה** the "Gesamtheit ihrer Repräsentanten." Köstlin, treating of the Church in Herzog's *Real-Encyclop.*, holds that an **ערה** is any general assembly, and that a **קהל** is a gathering for divine worship. Girdlestone, *Hebr. Synonyms*, p. 367, admits that it is not easy to distinguish between **קהל** and **ערה**, but thinks that "there is some reason for taking the first as generally referring to the *representative* gathering, while the second often signifies an informal massing of the people." Bedarshi, a much-prized Jewish writer on Hebrew synonyms, whose work dates from the thirteenth century, following the Talmud, decides empirically that a ruling **ערה**, i. e., a quorum for the transaction of business, must consist of not less than ten representative men; a **קהל**, on the contrary, is a promiscuous assembly. These are only a few of the definitions that might be cited.

We naturally turn to the Septuagint Version for light, but the help it offers is not so satisfactory as it might have been if the LXX. had observed some degree of uniformity in their renderings. In respect to **ערה**, however, there is little cause for complaint. In its 148 occurrences it has been translated by *συναγωγή* 130 times; in the remaining 18 it has been omitted, as pleonastic, eight times, Num. i. 58; xxvii. 20; xxxi. 12; Josh. ix. 18; xxii. 12, 18; 1 Kgs. viii. 5; in three instances, Job xvi. 7; Jer. vi. 8; Hos. vii. 12, the translators seem to have used a Hebrew text in which the word **ערה** was replaced by some other expression; twice, Num. iii. 7; xxxii. 4, **ערה** is rendered by *ἄνθρωποι Ἰσραὴλ*; other renderings are *σκηνή*, Num. xvi. 9; *ἐπιστάσεις*, verse 40; *παρεμβολή*, verse 46; *οἶκος*, Job xvi. 34; *βουλή*, Ps. i. 5, and *μαρτύρια*, Jer. xxx. 20. The last six, then, are the only real departures from practical uniformity, and these variations are easily justified. The LXX. therefore, treated **ערה** and *συναγωγή* as substantially equivalent. The same consistency does not appear in their renderings of **קהל**; for, while *ἐκκλησία* prevails, occurring in 76 out of 123 instances, *συναγωγή* is also given in not less than 37 places; *ὄχλος* occurs six times, *συνέδριον* twice, and *ἐκστάσεις* and *λαός* once each.<sup>1</sup> Whatever conclusion might be drawn from the almost uniform translation of **ערה** by *συναγωγή* is vitiated by the confusion in the renderings of **קהל**.

The English versions attempt to be consistent in respect to **ערה**, rendering

<sup>1</sup> For an analysis of these renderings as they occur in the various books, see Cremer, *Bibl. Theol. Woerterbuch*, s. v. *ἐκκλησία*.



it "congregation" when it refers to theocratic Israel, and "company" when it refers to Korah's conspiracy. The revised version corrects the few exceptions of the common version in all places but two, Ps. xxii. 16; Prov. v. 14, where both have "assembly." The renderings of קהל, on the contrary, are strangely arbitrary. Aside from the sixteen places where it is translated "company," the other renderings are about equally distributed between "assembly" and "congregation." With a single exception, Num. xxii. 4, the Revisers give "assembly" throughout Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers, Deuteronomy, Joshua, Judges, Samuel, Job, Joel, Micah; "congregation" throughout Kings, Chronicles, Ezra; "assembly" and "congregation" in Nehemiah, Psalms, Proverbs; "assembly" and "company" in Genesis, Jeremiah, Ezekiel. One might suspect that this confusion originated in the Revisers permitting themselves to be guided by the LXX. Not at all. The best scholarship of the nineteenth century is able to be independent in its arbitrariness.

What, then, is the distinction between these terms? Even a brief examination dispels the impression that they are used indiscriminately. Nor is it likely that the terms employed in such intimate relation to every movement of Israel's national life denote only the community in general, or a mere fortuitous concourse of its individual units. The more closely they are scrutinized, the more clearly it is seen that Hebrew writers not only distinguished between them, but that one at least, if not both, was used almost invariably with a unique and technical import. This is true of עדה. Is there no passage where it defines itself, or is defined for us? Such a definition occurs in Num. i. 2, "Take ye the sum of all the עדה of the children of Israel, by their families, by their fathers' houses, according to the number of the names, every male by their polls: from twenty years old and upward, all that are able to go forth to war in Israel." No incidental definition could be more explicit. Moses and Aaron are commanded to take the census of the עדה. They find (verse 46) that the עדה of Israel numbers 603,550 males of twenty years and upward. Another census of the עדה is taken at the close of the wanderings in the wilderness (Num. xxvi. 2), when it was found to consist of 601,730 men of twenty years old and upward. At the construction of the tabernacle a poll-tax of half a shekel was collected from "them that were numbered of the עדה," "from twenty years old and upward, for 603,550 men," Exod. xxxviii. 25, 26. When the spies brought up an evil report, and all the עדה in a riotous outbreak would have stoned Joshua and Caleb, the Lord said "How long shall I bear with this evil עדה, which murmur against me?... As I live, saith the Lord, surely as ye have spoken in mine ears, so will I do unto you: your carcasses shall fall in this wilderness, and all that were numbered of you, according to your whole number, from twenty years old and upward. I, the Lord, have spoken, surely this will I do unto this evil עדה," Num. xiv. 27-35. Here, then, was the central conception of the עדה ישראל. It was the national body politic,



the *πολιται*, composed of all the circumcised males above a certain age.<sup>1</sup> It had a fixed and well-determined constituency, that fluctuated only with the ebb and flow of the population from age to age. This fact reveals the etymological propriety of this technical term, and explains the fact already noted that it never occurs in the sense of an assembly gathered at a *fixed* time or place.<sup>2</sup> Right here, too, is the fundamental error in all the definitions cited above, in that they make the idea of an *actual assembly* the essential thing in the *ערה*, whereas it is altogether incidental.

Practically and primarily, then, the *ערה* stood for the nation in the strength and maturity of its manhood. Representing the nation in its wholeness, it was often used where, strictly speaking, all the people were included; e. g., "All the *ערה* of the children of Israel came to the wilderness of Sin," Exod. xvi. 1; cf. xvii. 1; Num. xxii. 1, 22, etc. When the people suffered from hunger or thirst, the *ערה* voiced the general discontent, Exod. xvi. 2; Num. xx. 2-11. It is the *ערה*, representing all the people, that kept the passover, Exod. xii. 3-47; were commanded to be holy, Lev. xix. 2; sinned through ignorance, Lev. iv. 13, 14; or mourned for Aaron, Num. xx. 29.

To convene so large a body of men in a judicial or deliberative assembly, or even to communicate directly to them the divine injunctions given to Moses, was of course out of question. The political organization of the people, which had developed itself in patriarchal fashion even before the establishment of the theocracy, found its natural representatives in the heads of families and tribes, the *זקנים* and the *נשיאים*. These coming together formed a smaller body which represented the whole *ערה*, as the *ערה* represented the whole nation. In the majority of instances where the word occurs, it seems to apply to this smaller body of elders and princes, but always with a tendency, almost irresistible, to glide into the larger technical sense of the entire political constituency, in which it so sinks its own individuality that in many instances it is impossible to distinguish between them. How large this representative body was there is no means of knowing, but it was of sufficient magnitude to have necessitated the selection of a still smaller body of seventy men to assist in the transaction of public business.

The *ערת ישראל* was the technical name of the whole body of circumcised males above twenty years of age, who either represented all the people, or were represented by the heads of their respective families.

<sup>1</sup> From the description of the *קהל* in Josh. viii., 35, which included "the women, the little ones, and the strangers that walked among them," Girdlestone draws the strange conclusion that the *קהל* "properly meant all the male adults of the nation," p. 363,—a proceeding not less remarkable than when, on the same page, he illustrates the meaning of *קהל* by passages that employ *ערה*.

<sup>2</sup> Gousset's definition of the *ערה* (*Lex. ling. hebr.*, 1743), as a *conventus hominum tempore indicto et locum indictum* is therefore not only wrong, but unsupported by a single fact.



Running through all the occurrences of קָהָל we perceive an explicit or implied reference to the fundamental idea—that of a gathering summoned, called, selected, or elected for a specific purpose or end. Sometimes it was gathered in view of a secular or social emergency (Num. xx. 10; Ezra x. 8), but far more frequently it designated an assembly of Israel gathered for strictly religious or theocratic purposes. Even in Deut. xxiii. 2–8, which seems to be the foundation of Vitranga's definition of the קָהָל<sup>1</sup>, it does not point to a close political corporation, but to a people called, elected from the surrounding nations to be holy unto the Lord; and therefore it was commanded to keep itself holy by the expulsion of illegitimate contaminations whether indigenous or foreign. In other words, it was a מְקֹרָא קֹדֶשׁ. As such, while it covered the same constituency as the עֵרָה (for which it is very rarely interchanged), it contemplates this constituency from a widely different point of view; e. g., Num. xx. 8, where Moses and Aaron were commanded to gather the עֵרָה, and they summoned the קָהָל. Plainly this term would be used to designate the assembled representatives of the עֵרָה, who, either during the hagiocracy (Lev. iv. 13), or during the monarchy (1 Chron. xiii. 2, 4; xxviii. 8, 29; 1. 10, 20; 2 Chron. i. 35; xxiii. 3), were formally summoned to act respecting the secular or religious interests of the people. From this it easily passed into the designation of a political meeting (1 Kgs. xii. 3), or even an army (Judg. xx. 2; 1 Sam. xvii. 47; Jer. l. 9). As a rule, however, the קָהָל denoted either that part of the עֵרָה of whatever rank which responded to the summons for a meeting at the אֹהֶל מוֹעֵד, and such meetings were usually for religious purposes; or a solemn assembly of all the people, such as that gathered before Sinai to receive the law “in the day of the קָהָל,” before the courts of the temple at its dedication and at Hezekiah's passover, or before the Lord in the days of Ezra and Nehemiah.

*The קָהָל was, in general, the name of any theocratic gathering of the people, and was composed of those who freely responded to a summons proceeding directly or indirectly from Israel's divine king.*

Apply the discriminations here made, and the correctness of the above conclusions will appear still more clearly. It was the עֵרָה that murmured against Moses and Aaron, and said (Exod. xvi. 2, 3), “Ye have brought us forth into this wilderness to kill this whole קָהָל with hunger.” The latter term, not the

<sup>1</sup> After a prolonged examination he concludes: “Vocabulum קָהָל valet significatu magis restricto et determinato quam vocabulum עֵרָה. Notat enim proprie universam alicujus populi multitudinem, vinctis societatis unitam et rempublicam sive civitatem quondam constituentem, cum vocabulum עֵרָה ex indole et vi significationis suae tantum dicat quemcunque hominum coetum et conventum, sive minorem sive majorem: imprimis tamen conditum statumque, non integri populi (etsi adeo latae sit significationis, ut et illi applicatur, ceu in textu modo adducto vidimus) sed certorum quorundam de populo virorum, quales sunt conventus et consilia magistratum.”—*De synagoga vetere*, p. 80. From this it appears that he laboriously misses the meaning of עֵרָה, as well as of קָהָל,



former, contemplated the people as brought forth, summoned, out of Egypt. The same distinction applies in Num. xvi. 3. In case the whole **עדה** of Israel sinned and the thing was hid from the eyes of the **קהל**, then, when the sin became known, the **קהל** was directed to take a bullock for a sin-offering, upon which the elders of the **עדה** were commanded to lay their hands, Lev. iv. 13-15. The **עדה** is here the whole body politic, the **קהל** its summoned representatives, further defined as the **זקני העדה**; for it is always the **עדה** and never the **קהל** that develops along genealogical lines. In 2 Chron. v. 2, 3, it is told that Solomon assembled "all the men of Israel" of all ranks at Jerusalem. In the sixth verse this assembly is rightly called the **עדה** of Israel. But in vi. 3, where it is said that Solomon "turned his face and blessed all the **קהל** of Israel,"—the same assembly,—the predominant thought is that of a congregation assembled for religious worship. With this view of **קהל** a deeper meaning is seen in the patriarchal blessings (Gen. xxviii. 3; xxxv. 11), than is conveyed by the words "multitude" or "company." A **קהל עמים**, or a **קהל גוים**, designated peoples or nations specially called, and, in so far as called, chosen out of the surrounding heathenism; it pointed not so much to a *convocation* as to an *evocation* of nations.

In the light of these definitions many facts otherwise inexplicable become easily understood. Since the constituency of the **עדה** depended on conditions beyond the control of the individual, it follows that we never read of a great or little **עדה**. Its magnitude was not contingent on the pleasure of those who composed it. Whether many or few, they represented the whole **עדה**, and transacted its business. Hence the pertinency of the Talmudic decision given by Bedarshi, that no ruling **עדה** should consist of less than ten elders. The **קהל**, on the contrary, had a constituency measured simply by personal willingness to respond to the summons. Because it was liable to be large or small we read of a **קהל רב**, Ps. xxii. 11, a **קהל גדול**, 1 Kgs. viii. 65, and even a **קהל גדול מאד**, 2 Chron. vii. 8. A man was born into the **עדה**; he went to the **קהל** or stayed away as it pleased him. This explains why no census was taken of the latter, but only of the former. In view of this distinction it is clear also why no instance occurs where women and children are spoken of as included in the **עדה**, and why their presence is repeatedly mentioned (Ezra x. 1; Neh. viii. 2; Jer. xliv. 15), or implied (Deut. v. 22) in the popular **קהל**. Since the former was the technical name for the Hebrew body politic, it would manifestly be inappropriate to use it of a non-Israelitish body, and it is never so used; the reverse is true of **קהל**, e. g., throughout Ezekiel. Because of the rebellious murmurings, sentence of death was pronounced on the **עדה**, as we have seen, but not on the **קהל**. The one naturally exercised political, judicial, and administrative functions; the other just as naturally did not. We meet the expression **כל-קהל ערת בני ישראל**, Num. xiv. 5; Exod. xii. 6; but never **כל-ערת קהל**, an impossible thought to a Hebrew writer to whom the former phrase was not a mere rhetorical amplification, but a

climax of social magnitudes. It is clear, finally, how such a writer might discriminate sharply between these terms, and yet, from different points of view, apply them to the same constituency.

Exceedingly interesting it is to follow these words in their historical evolution,—the עֵרָה into the later synagogue and sanhedrim, and the קָהָל into the New Testament ἐκκλησία; to trace their bearing on the fundamental conception of modern national churches; and to notice their misinterpretation and misuse in recent rationalistic criticism. The length of this paper, longer already than was anticipated, forbids anything beyond the mentioning of these lines of investigation.



## KOTTEK'S "DAS SECHSTE BUCH DES BELLUM JUDAICUM."

BY RICHARD J. H. GOTTHEIL, PH. D.,

Columbia College, New York City.

DAS SECHSTE BUCH DES BELLUM JUDAICUM [SYRISCH], nach der von Ceriani photolithographisch edirten Peschitta-Handschrift übersetzt und kritisch bearbeitet von Dr. Hermann Kottek. Berlin: *Rosenstein & Hildesheimer*. 1886. 8vo. 30 pp. text, 45 pp. introduction and translation.

This little publication, with its rather ostentatious title, gives us the first two chapters of the Sixth Book of the *περὶ τοῦ Ἰουδαϊκοῦ πολέμου* of Josephus in a Syriac translation. The text is a copy of the same edited by Ceriani in his photolithographic edition of the P<sup>s</sup>ittâ.<sup>1</sup> We must be thankful to Dr. Kottek for placing this, in many respects, interesting translation within the reach of ordinary students. At the same time, we would recommend care in the use of Dr. Kottek's text in its present form. Had he collated his proof-sheets once more with the MS., he would have saved his readers much useless work. The text seems to be very negligently edited. S'yâmê points are at times placed, at times not; neither Wau 'alıştâ nor Yâdh h'bhista are expressed. In the punctuation, tahtâyâ and 'elâyâ are either not noticed at all, or confounded with zaugâ. Nor is this all. The copula Wau is omitted, an 'âlah placed for an Hê, Dê(i)n for Gê(i)r, and words misspelt in a most confusing manner. In texts of the age and worth of the Ambrosian P<sup>s</sup>ittâ we have need of accurate diplomatic copies, such as those to which scholars like Lagarde, Sachau, Wright, etc., have accustomed us.<sup>2</sup> Further down I give a list of corrections, mainly made by collating again Ceriani's text. My own corrections I designate as such. I omit to note the errors in punctuation, in order not to swell the list unnecessarily.

The translation bears the superscription (fol. 679 [320 v.] inaccurately given by Dr. Kotték, p. 5) "مذكر مصنفه و مقصده في معرفة ما هو من سائر العلوم . الخ"

مقصودا . سہ خا [توہمت مخلصا] ؟ اور . . . . ا جہ [تہمتا] [سدا] خا ؟ ہے . [خا]  
سدا [اسدا] ؟ [توہمت مخلصا] ؟ [تہمتا] [سدا] خا ؟ ہے . [خا]

<sup>1</sup> In the preface Ceriani speaks of his having edited the text of this Sixth Book in his *Monumenta Sacra et Profana*, vol. V. I was unable to find this publication in any of the New York libraries. Prof. Lyon of Harvard University, to whom I turned for information, very kindly wrote to me (Sept. 11), "By reference to vol. V., fasc. I. of Ceriani's *Mon. Sac. et Prof.*, I find that book 6 (as far as I., 1-7) of Josephus' Jewish Wars is given in Syriac. The statement is made that the rest of book 6 would be in fasc. III., but this fasc. is not in the Harvard Library."

<sup>2</sup> The more so, since the editor himself (introd. p. 6) calls attention to the "accuracy and consistency" with which the points are placed. Had Dr. Kottek read a few more Syriac MSS., he would not have designated the two points placed under the third person feminine sing. of the Perfect as peculiar to this text. These two points, called m<sup>e</sup>pagg'dhânâ (bridle), are peculiarly Nestorian. The Jacobites make use of two points, one underneath and the other above the final Tau; cf. Nöldeke, *Syrische Grammatik*, § 7; Duval, *Traité de Grammaire Syriaque*, § 67.







Maccabees,"<sup>1</sup> early ascribed to Josephus. This would be the "taš'yâth b'nai šēmûni" of 'Abhdîšô'. The other items would cover the ground gone over by the sixth book of the "Bellum." See the scope of the same as laid down by Josephus himself in the preface, § 7. That the first part fell away, owing to the existence of the Maccabean books, is not surprising.

In the text I have noticed the following corrections:—p. 1: 1. 2, **חַבַּת**. 1. 5: The reading of the MS. **שִׁיחַ**, i. e., *sughâyâ*, is correct. It occurs again in Walton's Polyglott, 2 Macc. VIII. 16. See Payne Smith, col. 2521. Targ. **סוּגַיָּא**; Levy, TW., II. p. 143, where **שִׁיחַ** is a misunderstanding of Castell, p. 578. *ibid.* MS. **סח** for **סח**. 1. 6, MS. **שִׁיחַ**. 1. 8, **סח**; above **סח** MS. shows the word **סח**. MS. **סח**. 1. 9: For **סח** of the MS. read **סח** *omen, sign* = *κηδών*, not *סח*. MS. **סח**. 1. 9: For **סח** of the MS. read **סח** *omen, sign* = *κηδών*, not *סח*. MS. **סח**. 1. 11, MS. **סח**. 1. 13, MS. **סח** without Yûdh. The reading of the word rê(i)šâ is not always clear in old MSS. See Merx, ZDMG., xxxvii., p. 249. Even where it is so, one and the same MS. gives the word at times with, at times without the Yûdh. Note a, read **סח**.

p. 2: Read **סח**. 1. 5, **סח** is the correct reading. In the note appended to this word there is a strange confusion. **סח** is the exact equivalent of *τὴν περὶ τὸ ἄστυ χώραν*. Dr. Kottek is wrong (text, p. 30, Nachtrag) in assuming that the word denotes the inner portion of a city. Lee had already (Payne Smith, col. 36) translated correctly "in its borders." This rendering is supported as well by the passage in the Theophania of Eusebius, which is a free rendering of Luke XXI. 21, where our texts read **סח**, as opposed to the preceding **סח**, as it is by our passage here.<sup>2</sup> In the translation Dr. Kottek has given the proper meaning. I may add that the word **סח** occurs again in Hoffmann's Bar 'Alî (Kiel, 1874) p. 142:10, where **סח** has been changed from **סח**. 1. 6: The reading of the MS. is correct, i. e. **סח**; Cf. Prov. XXI. 26, where the Greek text has *ἀφειδῶς*. Payne Smith, col. 1223. 1. 7, MS. **סח**. 1. 8, MS. **סח**. 1. 9, MS. **סח**, **סח** for **סח**. 1. 11: Read **סח**, which may possibly be the reading of the MS. 1. 12, MS. **סח**.

p. 3: 1. 7, MS. **סח**. 1. 8, MS. **סח**. 1. 9, MS. **סח**. 1. 13: **סח** = *δεξιὰ τὴν χη*; where the text, as it now stands, is entirely unintelligible. 1. 17, MS. **סח**. 1. 18, MS. **סח**. 1. 20: MS. **סח** = *πρὶν*. See Bickell, *Carmina Nisibena*, glossary, p. 57. MS. **סח**. In the text we must read **סח** without S'yâmê, and omit note c. Dr. Kottek has

<sup>1</sup> *περὶ αὐτοκράτορος λογισμοῦ*.

<sup>2</sup> Josiphôn ben Gôrion (ed. Breithaupt, 1710), p. 809, סביבות ירושלים.



been misled by supposing ܐܕܒܬܐ to be feminine. George Karmseddinâyâ (Payne Smith, col. 1681) says expressly ܐܕܒܬܐ ܬܗܝ ܐܬܐ ܕܡܠܟܐ. Our text is an exact translation of the Greek *πρὶν ἐγγίσει τοῖς χόμασι*.

p. 4: 1. 3, MS. ܐܕܒܬܐ. 1. 4, MS. ܐܕܒܬܐ; note b, read ܐܕܒܬܐ. 1. 8, MS. ܐܕܒܬܐ. 1. 11, MS. ܐܕܒܬܐ. 1. 16, MS. ܐܕܒܬܐ.

p. 5: 1. 2, MS. ܐܕܒܬܐ. 1. 3, MS. ܐܕܒܬܐ, ܐܕܒܬܐ; delete note b, and cf. Payne Smith, col. 1705. 1. 13, MS. ܐܕܒܬܐ, ܐܕܒܬܐ. 1. 14, MS. ܐܕܒܬܐ. 1. 15, MS. ܐܕܒܬܐ. 1. 16, MS. ܐܕܒܬܐ, also 6:3. 1. 18, MS. ܐܕܒܬܐ. 1. 20, MS. ܐܕܒܬܐ.

p. 6: 1. 4: The manuscript reading is correct. Wau introduces the apodosis of the sentence commencing with ܐܕܒܬܐ. 1. 9, after ܐܕܒܬܐ MS. adds ܐܕܒܬܐ. 1. 11, the text is correct. ܐܕܒܬܐ = *ol perì tòn Iōannēn*. See Payne Smith, col. 479. 1. 14, MS. ܐܕܒܬܐ; delete note f, and cf. 6:4.

p. 7: 1. 7, read as in note a. ܐܕܒܬܐ = *τοὺς ἀλκίμους*. 1. 8, MS. ܐܕܒܬܐ. 1. 11, MS. ܐܕܒܬܐ. 1. 13, MS. ܐܕܒܬܐ. 1. 15, MS. ܐܕܒܬܐ.

p. 8: 1. 1, MS. ܐܕܒܬܐ, ܐܕܒܬܐ. 1. 2, MS. ܐܕܒܬܐ to distinguish it from ܐܕܒܬܐ. 1. 4, MS. ܐܕܒܬܐ. 1. 8, MS. ܐܕܒܬܐ. 1. 12, for the unintelligible ܐܕܒܬܐ read with the manuscript ܐܕܒܬܐ, which is not to be translated "with few," which would be ܐܕܒܬܐ, but "with great speed;" in the same sense as ܐܕܒܬܐ is used; see Cureton, *Ancient Syriac Documents*, ed. W. Wright, 56:24, Jes. 5:26; Knös, *Chrestomathia Syriaca*, p. 70; Wright, *Contributions to the Apoc. Lit. of the N. T.*, 31:23; or "suddenly," 'Aprêm, I, 74 D. 1. 15, MS. ܐܕܒܬܐ. 1. 16, MS. ܐܕܒܬܐ. 1. 17, MS. ܐܕܒܬܐ. We must undoubtedly read ܐܕܒܬܐ, although the manuscript reading is ܐܕܒܬܐ, Greek *μετὰ τοιούτων ὁπλων*. ܐܕܒܬܐ is omitted in Dr. Kottek's translation and in the Greek; but curiously enough, is found again in Whiston's translation. 1. 18, MS. ܐܕܒܬܐ. 1. 19, read ܐܕܒܬܐ. 1. 20, MS. ܐܕܒܬܐ. 1. 21, MS. ܐܕܒܬܐ, also 9:2. 1. 22, MS. ܐܕܒܬܐ.

p. 9: 1. 3, MS. ܐܕܒܬܐ. 1. 4, MS. ܐܕܒܬܐ, ܐܕܒܬܐ. 1. 6, MS. ܐܕܒܬܐ. 1. 7, MS. ܐܕܒܬܐ. 1. 8, MS. ܐܕܒܬܐ. 1. 9, MS. ܐܕܒܬܐ. 1. 10, MS. ܐܕܒܬܐ. 1. 11, MS. ܐܕܒܬܐ. 1. 14, MS. ܐܕܒܬܐ, ܐܕܒܬܐ. 1. 16, MS. ܐܕܒܬܐ. 1. 17, MS. ܐܕܒܬܐ. For the use of this form for ܐܕܒܬܐ see Wright, *The Homilies of Aphraates*, I, list of errata. MS. ܐܕܒܬܐ. 1. 18, MS. ܐܕܒܬܐ. Read ܐܕܒܬܐ as in manuscript. For the meaning "commence" see Bernstein's *Lexicon* to his *Chrestomathy*, p. 547.



p. 10: 1. 1, MS. ܡܚܝܝܐ ܕܥܡܝܐ. 1. 2, MS. ܠܚܝܬܝܐ. 1. 3, MS. ܡܚܝܝܐ. 1. 6, MS. ܡܚܝܝܐ. 1. 11, MS. ܡܚܝܝܐ. 1. 22, MS. ܡܚܝܝܐ. 1. 23, MS. ܡܚܝܝܐ.

p. 11: 1. 3, MS. ܡܚܝܝܐ. 1. 4, MS. ܡܚܝܝܐ. 1. 6: The text here is in perfect order. I see no necessity whatever for adding ܡܚܝܝܐ. Such constructions (where the subject is repeated by a possessive pronoun) occur often in Syriac (Nöldeke, *Syrische Gram.*, § 317), as in other Semitic dialects. Cf. ܙܝܕ ܩܡ ܐܒܘܗ Nöldeke, *Mandäische Gram.*, § 275, p. 409; Caspari-Müller, *Arab. Gram.*, § 485. For the intransitive use of ܡܚܝܝܐ see Payne Smith, col. 1739. 1. 7, MS. ܡܚܝܝܐ. 1. 8, after ܡܚܝܝܐ MS. reads ܐܦ. 1. 9, MS. ܡܚܝܝܐ as proposed in note c. 1. 10: Here too the text, although paraphrasing the original, is correct. The MS. shows a point after ܡܚܝܝܐ, indicating that this word is not to be construed with the next one, but with the preceding. I hardly see how Dr. Kotték could translate this sentence as he has. ܡܚܝܝܐ is never construed with ܡܚܝܝܐ. Waving the question raised in note d, whether ܡܚܝܝܐ can have the meaning "envy," as the text stands, we can only take ܡܚܝܝܐ as the plural fem. of ܡܚܝܝܐ (for this form of the adjective used as a noun see Nöldeke, *Mand. Gram.*, § 215 a, p. 299) *that which is stable, firm*, Castell-Michaelis, p. 969; Bernstein, *Lexicon*, p. 369. Cf. ܡܚܝܝܐ two lines lower down (Bernstein, *loc. cit.*, 570; Hoffmann, *De hermeneuticis apud Syros Aristoteleis*, 216:11 seq., ܡܚܝܝܐ, Wright, *Catalogue*, 506 b.

p. 12: 1. 1, MS. ܡܚܝܝܐ ܡܚܝܝܐ. 1. 4, MS. ܡܚܝܝܐ. 1. 5, MS. ܡܚܝܝܐ. 1. 6: The text is here in order. ܡܚܝܝܐ refers to ܡܚܝܝܐ (for similar constructions see 3:1; 13:6); ܡܚܝܐ = ܡܚܝܐ. 1. 9, MS. ܡܚܝܐ. 1. 10, MS. ܡܚܝܐ. 1. 13, MS. ܡܚܝܐ. 1. 16, MS. ܡܚܝܐ.

p. 13: 1. 4, MS. ܡܚܝܐ. 1. 5, MS. ܡܚܝܐ. 1. 6, MS. ܡܚܝܐ. 1. 8, MS. ܡܚܝܐ. 1. 14, MS. ܡܚܝܐ.

p. 14: 1. 3, read ܡܚܝܐ. 1. 5, MS. ܡܚܝܐ. 1. 9, read ܡܚܝܐ. 1. 15, MS. reads ܡܚܝܐ in place of ܡܚܝܐ, and *vice versa*.

p. 15: 1. 5, MS. ܡܚܝܐ. 1. 6, MS. ܡܚܝܐ. 1. 8, MS. ܡܚܝܐ in place of ܡܚܝܐ. 1. 16, MS. ܡܚܝܐ. 1. 17, MS. ܡܚܝܐ. 1. 20, manuscript reads ܡܚܝܐ, which I have met with only in the meaning "angustia, tristitia;" Castell-Michaelis, 642; Bernstein, 366; Hoffmann, *De hermeneuticis*, 196:31, "morbis lethalis," Aphrem, II., 83 D, 84 C; "periculum morbis," *ibid.*, 96 b. Dr. Kotték is right in reading ܡܚܝܐ (18:4; 29:14), Greek βοή. Land, *Anecdota Syriaca*, III., 205:15; Lagarde,



*Analecta Syriaca*, 119:22, 24; Castell-Michaelis gives ܩܬܬܐ as the plural. Read ܩܬܬܐ, Bernstein, p. 366; Duval *Grammaire Syriacque*, p. 260; Bar 'Ebhryâ, Grammar (ed. Martin), I., 32:4,

p. 16: 1. 1, MS. ܥܬܐ, 1. 8, manuscript has the wrong reading ܥܬܬܐ. 1. 12, MS. ܬܬܐ. 1. 14, MS. ܬܬܐ. 1. 16, MS. ܬܬܐ. I suppose that 'Apoluon (Josêphôn ben Gorion, ed. Breithaupt, 1710, p. 821, has ܐܪܝܡܐܢ) is some old corruption of 'Iaelpos + Σίμων.

p. 17: 1. 1, MS. ܥܬܐܬܐ. 1. 2, MS. ܥܬܐܬܐ. 1. 3, MS. ܥܬܐܬܐ. 1. 4, MS. ܥܬܐܬܐ. 1. 6, MS. ܥܬܐܬܐ. 1. 9, MS. reads ܥܬܐܬܐܬܐ. 1. 14, MS. ܥܬܐܬܐܬܐ.

p. 18: 1. 12, MS. ܥܬܐܬܐܬܐ. 1. 13, MS. ܥܬܐܬܐܬܐ. 1. 14, MS. ܥܬܐܬܐܬܐ. 1. 20, MS. ܥܬܐܬܐ. 1. 22, MS. ܥܬܐܬܐ.

p. 19: 1. 2: The change of ܥܬܐ into ܥܬܐ is unnecessary, although I know of no such use of the word. It is guaranteed by p. 17:5. 1. 7, MS. ܥܬܐ. 1. 12, MS. ܥܬܐܬܐ.

p. 20: 1. 1: I read the first word ܥܬܐ. 1. 2: The addition of ܥܬܐ is unnecessary; Payne Smith, col. 479. 1. 3, MS. ܥܬܐ. 1. 5, MS. ܥܬܐܬܐܬܐ. 1. 8, MS. ܥܬܐ. 1. 9, MS. ܥܬܐܬܐܬܐ is correct. I fail to see in what way the proposed emendation would better the text. "And another Bar Mattai" clearly distinguishes him from the four sons of the other of the same name. 1. 9, MS. ܥܬܐ. 1. 10, MS. ܥܬܐܬܐ. 1. 11, MS. ܥܬܐܬܐ.

p. 21: 1. 1, MS. ܥܬܐ, i. e., ܥܬܐ, to distinguish it from ܥܬܐ. 'Ebhdkhos (private manuscript of Professor Sachau, Berlin), fol. 55 a; ܥܬܐܬܐܬܐ; in note a read ܥܬܐ for ܥܬܐ. 1. 9, delete point after ܥܬܐ; read ܥܬܐܬܐܬܐ. 1. 13, MS. ܥܬܐܬܐ. 1. 15, in the MS. the traces of the S'yâmê points over ܥܬܐ are still to be seen.

p. 22: 1. 1, MS. ܥܬܐ. 1. 4, MS. ܥܬܐܬܐܬܐ. 1. 5, MS. ܥܬܐ. 1. 9, MS. ܥܬܐ. 1. 12: Omit the unintelligible Dâlath of ܥܬܐܬܐܬܐ; it is not in the MS.

p. 23: 1. 3, MS. ܥܬܐ. 1. 4, read ܥܬܐ. 1. 10, MS. ܥܬܐ. So 1. 12.

p. 24: 1. 3, MS. ܥܬܐܬܐܬܐ. 1. 10, MS. ܥܬܐܬܐܬܐ. 1. 13, MS. ܥܬܐܬܐܬܐ.

p. 25: 1. 4, MS. ܥܬܐܬܐܬܐ. 1. 7, MS. ܥܬܐܬܐܬܐ. 1. 10, MS. ܥܬܐܬܐܬܐ. 1. 15, MS. ܥܬܐܬܐܬܐ. 1. 16, MS. reads ܥܬܐܬܐܬܐ after the word ܥܬܐܬܐܬܐ. 1. 21, MS. ܥܬܐܬܐܬܐ.

p. 26: 1. 2, read ܥܬܐܬܐܬܐ. 1. 5, MS. ܥܬܐܬܐܬܐ, compare 1. 7. 1. 7, MS. ܥܬܐܬܐ, i. e.,



ܒܥܕܐ. 1. 8, read ܒܥܕܐ, Duval, *Gram. Syr.*, p. 125. Bar 'Ebhrâyâ, *Gram.* I. 26:25. Read ܒܥܕܐ [ܥܕܐ] ܒܥܕܐ. 1. 11, MS. ܒܥܕܐ.

p. 27: 1. 1, MS. ܒܥܕܐ. Nöldeke, *Syr. Gram.*, § 239. 1. 2, in the MS. I see the traces of a bê(i)th before ܒܥܕܐ. 1. 12, MS. ܒܥܕܐ. This mistake between Dâlath and Rîš occurs often in the Syriac Bible; compare cases such as ܒܥܕܐ, ܒܥܕܐ, Gen. II. 12; ܒܥܕܐ, 1 Chron. XI. 47; ܒܥܕܐ, Gen. IV. 18; ܒܥܕܐ, Gen. X. 3; ܒܥܕܐ, Gen. X. 7; ܒܥܕܐ, Gen. X. 19; ܒܥܕܐ, Gen. X. 22; ܒܥܕܐ, XIV. 1; ܒܥܕܐ, *ibid.*; ܒܥܕܐ, XXII. 22. Bar 'Ebhrâyâ, in his 'aušar ('râzê, reads ܒܥܕܐ *ibid.*; ܒܥܕܐ, XXV. 3; ܒܥܕܐ, XXV. 14; ܒܥܕܐ, XXVI. 1; *ZDMG.* XXXI. 317. Perles: *Melemata Peschittoniana*, p. 19. 1. 16, MS. ܒܥܕܐ. 1. 20, MS. ܒܥܕܐ, read ܒܥܕܐ.

p. 28: 1. 5, MS. ܒܥܕܐ. 1. 7, MS. ܒܥܕܐ. 1. 11, read ܒܥܕܐ. 1. 13, the incorrect reading ܒܥܕܐ has been caused by the occurrence of the word in the next line. MS. ܒܥܕܐ. 1. 18, MS. reads ܒܥܕܐ, as proposed in note b. What follows in the MS. I cannot make out. The three points do not indicate a gap. The following word gives no sense. Nor can the middle letter be a Semkath, as no MSS. of this age which have come under my notice show this letter bound to the next one on the left side. See Wright: *The Homilies of Aphraates*, p. 15, note. ܒܥܕܐ does not, in any case, belong here. 1. 20, Dr. Kotték's emendation will not hold, as ܒܥܕܐ is unnecessary. Read ܒܥܕܐ = μέγα, and translate "is no great thing."

p. 29: 1. 5, MS. ܒܥܕܐ. 1. 12, MS. ܒܥܕܐ.

So much for the text. As regards the German translation, I am sorry that I am not able to speak more favorably. The translation of an Oriental text may be of use in either of two ways. It may assist the Orientalist in understanding a difficult passage, and in getting at the exact meaning of a certain word. It may, however, furnish the non-Orientalist with a faithful picture of what the original text offers. In either case, exactness is demanded, even at the expense of style, as Gildermeisten has done, *Rheinisches Museum*, XXVII., pp. 525 seq. It is true, Dr. Kotték intended to offer us "as literal a translation as possible" (p. 16). I do not think he has been successful in carrying out his intention. At times he has allowed himself to be led astray by the Greek "translation," in face of the plain sense of the Syriac, viz., p. 4:13, the word r(h)ômâyê is omitted as in the Greek; p. 4:18, s'ghâ is translated "surround" (φράσσω), with which meaning I have never met; p. 21, l. 9, "The former bad the rebels in the presence of the Romans;"—the second clause being the Greek καὶ πρὸ τῶν Ῥωμαίων ἰστάμενοι, which is omitted in the Syriac. In a translation it is often necessary to add a word or two to render the sense of the original clear. Such additions should invariably be put in brackets.



See transl. p. 18, l. 11: "would be compelled to lament;" p. 19, l. 1: "for;" l. 11: "they asked themselves;" p. 21, l. 13: "although the Roman;" p. 22, l. 1: "individualities." Dr. Kottek has not seen that it is but an awkward rendering of the Greek διέτεθη τὰ φρονήματα. P. 36, l. 4: "naturally;" l. 6: "in truth," etc. A number of passages are insufficiently—some incorrectly—translated. I will only notice a few instances; e. g., p. 1, l. 4 "aufreiben," instead of some such word as "consume" (Gr. νέμω). Dr. Kottek, it seems, has understood the word r'â in the sense of ra'; l. 7, damkârbin (h)wau 'amhôn means "those who fought with them" τοῖς μαχομένοις, and not "those who fought with one another (baḥ'dhâdhê); l. 12 is translated: "reviled their enemies, and went courageously to battle with them." I do not know on what authority Dr. Kottek gives k'lâ this meaning. We must translate: "they derided (maklê(i)n) [the idea of] fighting with their enemies." For k'lâ with 'al in this meaning see 29:10, where the whole construction is very similar; 'Aph'el, Bar 'Ebhârâ, 'Aṣar (')Râzê to Gen. XII. 4; Bickell, *Carmina Nisibena*, p. 63; Michaelis (Cast.-Mich., p. 798) doubts that the root k'lâ has this meaning. But see the examples quoted above, and compare Levy TW. II., p. 362. P. 3, l. 12 must be translated: "nor their courage shaken by their suffering" ἀνάλωτον δὲ τὴν ἐπὶ συμφοραῖς ἐνθυμίαν εἶναι. What follows is also badly translated. It is an awkward rendering of the Greek, and must read: "for what would they not enjoy [favored] with good fortune—δεξιὰ τύχη—who, through evil, are led to valor" taknâith = πρὸς ἀλκὴν. The root t'kan is often used in this more ethical sense. Compare 'abhdê taknê 'Aprêm I. 395 A. 272 C.; dubbârê taknê Wright, *Catalogue*, 573b; Eusebius, on *Theophania* II. c. 71; Bernstein, *Lexicon*, p. 570. taknâith Bickell, *Carmina Nisibena*, p. 70. This makes note 5 on p. 19 trans. unnecessary, as also the addition in the text of "they asked themselves." L. 18, translate "the Jews sought to hinder them in their works;" l. 20, "and before they came near to the banks their hopes were blighted," reading 'adh and tukhlâthhôn. Ψυχρότεροι πῆς ἐλπίδος; compare tukhlânâ, 7:15; p. 4, l. 1, supply "but;" l. 4, the text reads w'men, where the Waw does not seem to be in the right place; p. 20, trans. note 4 is wrong. 'en hâlê(i)n nezkyân l'dhîlhôn = εἰ πάντα κρατήσεν; *ibid.*, note 5, read: "wanting in the Syriac;" p. 7, l. 12, "and that the ascent of the wall is difficult, I am the first to say to you;" l. 15, "the good fruits of bravery" belongs to the preceding sentence. In the MS. there is a point after d'hallîṣûthâ. Translate: "and first let the hope for a proper commencement—do you not be withheld [by this argument (a free rendering of τὸ πινὰς ἰσως ἀποτρίπον)]—come to you from the perseverance of the Jews;" *ibid.* note a must be omitted, Nöldeke, § 24; p. 9, l. 11, read w'kallîl; p. 10, l. 11, "of those, however, who were in the cohort, one did service, by name Sabinus." Dr. Kottek seems to have read pâlhîn, which would agree with the Greek στρατευομένων; l. 19, the translation "that my power and good-will follow upon thy victory" gives no sense. Unless the Syriac translator has taken n'mann'ôn bâthar as equivalent to the Greek ἀπὸ κολωνθήσαι, we must read: d'bhâthar hail(i) w'sebhyâ-



n(i) n'mann'ôn sâkhôthâkh. Whiston translates "my fortune;" with what authority, I do not know. The received text has σὺν. P. 12, l. 9, "as if through some evil genius" â(i)kh d'men = ἀναλόγως?; p. 13, l. 14, I would emend the text in the following way: šuryâ (h)wâ lakrâbhâ bh'ma'ânâ takkîphâith; p. 15, l. 4, "a man whom I had seen in the war" ὃν ἐγὼ κατ' ἐκεῖνον ἰστῶρησα τὸν πόλεμον; p. 15, l. 19, "fell upon his side;" p. 16, l. 1, the fifth, sixth and seventh words seem to be out of place, and to belong to the second line, which would then read: w'men yûkârêh d'zainâ lâ 'eškakh. P. 16, l. 5, Dr. Kottek gives the curious translation: "lost his courage" instead of "his soul expired," i. e., he gave up the ghost. Compare an exactly similar expression, Wright: *Contributions to the apocryphal Literature*, 56:4; Zunz: *Literaturgeschichte der Synagogalen Poesie*, p. 641. The word naphšâ is generally omitted, Mark xv. 3; 2 Macc. i. 7, 13 (Cast.-Mich.). P. 17, l. 4, the translation "On the 17th of Tamus [read Tammûz] all the people were humiliated" is impossible. Dr. Kottek seems to have read gurgâyê, a word which seldom occurs in Syriac literature, Payne Smith, col. 774. If the text reading—gurâghâ—is right, we must translate: "there was an excitement on account of the [scarcity of] people." I regard as doubtful, however, the MS. reading, which ought probably to be some word corresponding to the Greek ἀπορία; p. 17, l. 9, Dr. Kottek entirely ignores the word lêh. Translate: "The offerings should be allowed him (i. e., it should be allowed him to bring offerings) with the aid (b'yadh) of such Jews as he should select for himself;" l. 13, lam'sâph "to consume it;" p. 18, l. 14, 'en is omitted in the translation, which should read "seeing that foreign nations," and should be connected with the foregoing. "But you" commences a new sentence; l. 22, "bore captivity." P. 19, l. 13, k'bhar not "perhaps," but "already, now," Gr. ἤδη; p. 20, l. 16, "cheerfully" is omitted in the translation; Gr. ἀσμέντοι; p. 22, l. 1, the text here is very difficult to understand. Dr. Kottek's translation gives no sense. Some emendation is necessary. If in lines 3 and 4 we change the places of r(h)ômâyê and yûdhâyê respectively, we get a sense approaching the Greek original: "and [indeed] so far did all their wickedness [reach]—men who should, by rights, have been plunged into sorrow and grief, if one of the Romans had shown the intention ('emar) of desecrating (n'awwel and not ne'ôl, as Dr. Kottek takes it. ἐξυπρίζουεν, compare 17:9 trans. p. 37, note 6) their (the Jews') sanctuary—[that], because the Jews were [steeped] in such wickedness, the Romans themselves commenced to despise [them]." P. 23, l. 8, s'kubhlâ "opposition;" p. 25, l. 25. It has been entirely misunderstood, and has unnecessarily occasioned note 1, p. 41, trans. If we make one or two emendations, the Syriac text corresponds exactly with the Greek. The word rê'sâ 25:23 ought to have shown the way. We must read 25:23 dh'khudhnawâthâ; 26:1 wath'rênâyâ men 'akhsehra dhê(i)n garb'yaitâ dh'ithêh "so that they raised the foremost one of the banks over against that corner of the inner court which [looked] to the north-west, a second one against the northern edifice, which was between its two gates. The other two were at the













3:15; men kulhôn, 4:5 = πάντων; šabhkê, 4:16 = ἀφ᾽ ἑῷα. If the following words of the text are correct,—perhaps we ought to read hânôn,—they are a poor rendering of the Greek τῶν προστηδόντων. 'adh nê'thê... k'râbhâ l'idhaihôn, p. 5, l. 2 = εἰς χεῖρας ἐλθεῖν; nettebh 'al š'wâr'hôn, p. 8, l. 21. Dr. Kottek affirms (preface, p. 15) that there occur in the translation many words which are only to be found again in the Aramaic—by which, I suppose, he means the dialects of the Targumîm and Talmûdhîm. I have been unable to find such, and am sorry that Dr. Kottek has so limited the number which he himself quotes. And even these three vanish, when looked at a little closer. The word š'bhak, "permit" does occur in Syriac, Mark i. 34, w'lâ šâbhek (h)wâ l'hôn. This passage, as well as the others cited Cast.-Mich. p. 888, s. v. šâbhôkâ, belong under the rubric š'bhak. Bernstein, *Lexicon*, p. 500. For the 'Ethp'el in the same meaning, Hahn and Sieffert, *Chrestomathia Syriaca* (1825), p. 224. For k'nâ "envy," Dr. Kottek could have cited, in support of his theory, its occurrence in Christian Palestinian Aramaic (Franciscus Miniscalchi Erizzo, *Evangeliarium Hierosolymitanum*, etc., p. 393). My collections for Syriac lexicography do not contain the word in that meaning in Edessenian Syriac. k'nê'thâ, Job v. 2 (Bernstein, p. 449) is simply the Hebrew kîn'âh. Dr. Kottek would, however, have done better to have left this word out of his argument, as it rests (p. 11, l. 10 and note d) on the very slender basis of conjecture and emendation. I have shown above how untenable both are. Compare also 18:15. The form of the root gûph, 24:11 (not gaph, as Dr. Kottek has it) can as well be read m'ghayy'phîn in Pa'el, for which Payne Smith, col. 687, gives one authority. The Targumîm seem also to use this word as an 'Ay'n-U one. Levy, TW., I., 131 (the place to which Dr. Kottek refers) gives gûph.

If the external arguments fail thus to support the theory propounded, so do the internal ones taken from a comparison of the Syriac with the Greek text. From a consideration of the general character of the text, very little can be won. Few of the translations from the Greek—if we except those of the Aristotelian Canon—keep closely to their original. Few translators are as conscientious as Sargis Riš'ainâyâ (Lagarde, *Analecta Syriaca*, p. 134:23 seq.). On the contrary, they seek rather to give only the meaning conveyed by their originals. On this point, Licentiat Ryssel has summed up the evidence in his two excellent essays, *Ueber den text-kritischen Werth der Syrischen Uebersetzungen Griechischer Klassiker*, I., II. Leipzig, 1880.

Our translation of Josephus belongs to the second of the three divisions of Ryssel (I., p. 4). But this would surely be no reason (Kottek, preface, p. 9) to doubt its having a Greek original. The other arguments might be noticed here. ch. 1, § 5: If we accept the very probable conjecture of Dr. Kottek himself, both texts will agree. § 5: The opening sentences of the speech, as it stands in the Syriac version, seem to me more in accord with what has preceded than in the Greek. Josephus says expressly that Titus was of the opinion that "exhortations



and promises would strengthen the courage of his soldiers." ch. IV. § 1: I have not the Syriac text at hand; though I doubt whether there is any real difference between it and the Greek. I understand the Syriac to mean that the Romans first weakened and partly demolished the gate, and then applied ladders and fire. ch. 5. § 3: The Syriac translator has simply blundered here, having been led astray by the preceding mention of the night of the festival. In the same way, many of the "additions" (as 3:10; 5:13) can be explained as omissions on the part of the Syriac translator. On the whole, he seems to strive after conciseness of expression, ch. 2: 3, n. 2; ch. 3:1. In ch. 1, § 6, note 3, *ὁρμῇ τινι δαιμονίῳ* did not suit the Christian Syrian; for which reason he altered it. Ryssel, *loc. cit.*, I., 4; II., 50. To the same category belong the changes in ch. 2, § 4, note 3, ch. 2, § 10, Pudens succumbs to Jonathan rather than to chance. See ch. 1, § 1, note 6, § 8, note 1. *οὐκ ἀσημος ἦν ἀνὴρ* is omitted as not necessary for the sense; *ibid.* note 9, it is only the first five words which are left out in the Syriac. The translator did not deem it necessary to add these words, as the fact is easily understood from the narrative itself.

It may be permitted me to call attention to some lexicographical points which I have noticed while reading the text. 1:10 m'phalpal in the sense of "stained" *φύρω*. Hex. Jerem. 2:3 (Cast.-Mich.); Bar 'Alî ed. Hoffmann, 228:7; Payne Smith, col. 1504; 'Aprêm I., 205 A. Compare farther on 21:18, where it is a translation *ad sensum* of *θερμάς τὰς χεῖρας ἔχοντες*; 29:10 in the meaning of the German "wälzen" (*Sindban*, ed. Baethgen, 9:10); Targûmish כלכל (Levy, TW., II., 271). p. 2, l. 2, lâlâ bhûnâyâ = *ἀπόγνωσις* "desperation" (to be added Payne Smith, col. 469). p. 2, l. 4, kudhnawâthâ. Payne Smith, col. 1181, has a remark on this passage. p. 2, l. 9, tašb'yâthâ. Jer. 2:32, 4:30; 'Aprêm I., 345 D; *Spicilegium Syriacum*, 26:16, 48:3. In the same sense sebhtâ, l. 12; Eusebius, *Theophania*, I., 4:1; Jes. 3:18; Hoffmann, *de hermeneuticis*, 203:27. Curious is the use of nestakbal. p. 2, l. 12, "arrive, come to." Levy TW., II., 185. p. 14, l. 15 it has its usual signification. p. 3, l. 3, t'hebbh, of which the P<sup>e</sup>al is not given. Cast.-Mich. p. 936; see ZDMG., XXIV., 268:25; Bar 'Ebhrâyâ to Jes. 19:2, Tullberg 14, note p. 12; Dionysius Telmahrensensis 117:8, note, p. 303; Bickell, *Carmina Nisibena*, p. 69 s. v. p. 4, l. 1, 'ethpakkah; 29:16. Bickell, *loc. cit.* p. 60, 'Ebhdkhos (private MS. of Prof. Sachau, Berlin) fol. 26a. *يَبْقِي خَفِيَّةٌ ۚ مِنَ السَّاجِ ۚ يَبْقِي (!) كَدَ* in the meaning "pacare," 'Aprêm, II., 242 C; "temperare," *ibid.* I., 10 A, 16, 5 C; *Spic. Syr.*, 21:3. p. 5, l. 19, *سَعْدِي* (sic) 24:11; *سَعْدِي* "scutus"? p. 8, l. 3, šu'lâyâ, "superbia." 'Aprêm, II., 119 D, 124 F; I., 339 E. p. 10, l. 2, šuph'ân, "profusio." l. 15, šîyûthâ, "color of the face," where the masc. 'ukkâmâ next to h'wâth is strange. Nöldeke, ZDMG., XXXVII., 535, note 1. The citation from Titus of Bostra is a slip of the pen, as the word mentioned there is šanyûthâ. 'Ebhdkhos also gives the pronunciation as trisyllabic (fol. 137 b). *يَبْقِي ۚ سَعْدِي ۚ كَدَ* with the marginal

note *الحسنة الجميلة* *סארגלין* p. 11, l. 4, m'arg'lin "roll." Prov. XVI. 3; Hex. MS. or. Berl. Petermann, 1:19 (Sachau, *Kurzes Verzeichniss der Sachau'schen Sammlung*, p. 34, No. 49:4). *עֶתְפָּא* Ethpa, "roll oneself," *Spic. Syr.*, 27:25; *ערגיל* Levy, TW., II., 243. p. 13, l. 7, *ḥal*, "dig," add to Payne Smith, col. 1268. *durîê*, "lances," 14:4, Payne Smith, col. 858. I think that the Greek *δόρυ*, *δόρατος* (*δοῦρατος*) is in this word. p. 5, l. 4; 15, l. 22, *šâphyê*, Bernstein, *Lexicon*, 530. Bar 'Alî (private MS. of Prof. Sachau in Berlin). *מעטא סארגלין* *בזאב* *חיסא* *חדיד* *הדי* *ידחל* *ב* *לחם* . *סא* p. 17:12, *math'em* (?)—of which I do not know the meaning. Dr. Kottek, in his translation, has mistaken Castell's (p. 948) "gemino" for "gemo." Bar 'Alî, ed. Hoffmann, 269:25 seq. p. 23, l. 3, *šammar*, "send," 'Aprêm, I., 517 F, etc. p. 24, l. 5, *methdag-g'sîn* = 'adhgeš, Payne Smith, col. 823. p. 24, l. 14, *yulpânâ*. p. 26, l. 4, *t'âšâ* "labor." 'Aprêm, II., 118 A; I., 195 F, 420 F; Elias of Tîrhân, 3:10.

There are other matters to which I would gladly call attention; but I have already gone beyond the limits I had placed for myself. In conclusion, I can only hope that Dr. Kottek may soon be able to give us the rest of this interesting translation—perhaps, too, in a little better form.



## THE STROPHICAL ORGANIZATION OF HEBREW TRIMETERS.

BY PROF. CHARLES A. BRIGGS, D. D.,

Union Theological Seminary, New York.

An absence in Europe for eight months prevented me from continuing the series of articles on Hebrew Poetry, begun in the *HEBRAICA* in April, 1886, until the present time. In the first article I presented some specimens of the trimeter movement, with a study of the lines and their interrelation in the varied forms of Parallelism. I now purpose to consider the strophical organization of the trimeter poems. The strophes are sometimes marked externally by the initial letters of the strophes being in alphabetical order, or by refrains. But in most cases, the strophical organization can be determined only by a careful study of the poem, with reference to the breaks in the sense and emotion, and of the parallelism of the sections on a larger scale. There is great freedom and variety in the strophical organization.

1) The simplest strophe is the distich. We have an example of this in the alphabetical Psalm xxxiv.

אברכה את-יהוה בכל-עת

תמיד תהלתו בפי

ביהוה תתהלל נפשי

ישמעו טגוים וישמחו

גדלו ליהוה אתי

ונרוממה שמו יחדו

דרשתי את-יהוה וענני

ומכל מגורותי הצילני

הביטו אליו ונהרו

ופניהם אל יחפרו

זה-עני קרא ויהוה שמע

ומכל צרותיו הושיעו

These six strophes sufficiently illustrate the movement. The strophes continue through the letters of the Hebrew alphabet. There is one letter omitted, namely, the ך that should come in between ך and ן. There is also an additional

strophe at the end with פ. This shows that the original poem has been changed by omission and addition in these two instances, and opens our eyes to look for other similar modifications of Hebrew poems where the alphabetical structure does not aid us to determine them. These lines are all trimeters except the first in the strophe with י. The tetrameter here seems to be designed to make an antithesis between the calling and the answering.

2) We have a specimen of a trimeter poem with strophes of four lines in the prayer Psalm III.

## I.

יהוה מה-רבו צרי  
רבים קמים עלי  
רבים אמרים לנפשי  
אין ישועתה-לו באלהים

## II.

ואתה יהוה מגן-בעדי  
כבודי ומרים ראשי  
קולי אל-יהוה אקרא  
ויענני מהר קדישי

## III.

אני שכבתי ואישנה  
הקיצותי כי-יהוה יסמכני  
לא-אירא מרובות עם  
אשר-סביב שתו עלי

## IV.

קומי הושיעני אלהי  
כי-הכית את-כל-איבי לחי  
שני רשעים שברת  
ליהוה הישועה על-עמך ברכתך

At the close of strophes I. and II. the Massoretic text gives סלה. This is thought by some to mark strophical divisions at times. I do not believe this. These strophes are so arranged that the second is antithetical to the first and the fourth to the third. But the strophes are really in introverted parallelism, in that the two middle strophes are antithetical to the strophes that begin and close the prayer. The lines are trimeters with the exception of the initial and the concluding lines of the last strophe. Here the movement is changed to the tetrameter in the last line, in order that it may become more deliberate and quiet at the end,



expressing the firm confidence of the Psalmist in his God. But we can see no reason for a change to the tetrameter movement in the first line. Accordingly we have stricken out the יהוה which is unnecessary to the thought and really out of place in the rhythm. We have found a large number of examples in Hebrew poetry and prophecy in which divine names have been inserted by later editors who did not understand the rhythm. It is also probable that the relative אשר in the closing line of the third strophe is such a prosaic addition. It may be combined with סביב by Maqqeph, but it is more commonly omitted in Hebrew poetry.

3) Psalm CXLVIII. gives us an example of strophes of six lines.

## I.

הללו את-יהוה מן-השמים  
הללוהו כמו מרומים  
הללוהו כל מלאכיו  
הללוהו כל צבאיו  
הללוהו שמש וירח  
הללוהו כל כוכבי-אור

## II.

הללוהו שמי השמים  
והמים אשר-מעל השמים  
יהללו את-שם יהוה  
כי-הוא צוה ונבראו  
ויעמידם לעד לעולם  
חק נתן ולא-יעבור

## III.

הללו את-יהוה מן-הארץ  
תנינים וכל תהמות  
אש וברד שלג-וקיטור  
רוח-סערה עשה דברו  
ההרים וכל גבעות  
עץ-פרי וכל ארזים

## IV.

החיה וכל בהמה  
רמש וצפור כנף  
מלכי-ארץ וכל לאמים

שרים וכל שפטי-ארץ  
בחורים וגם בתולות  
זקנים עם נערים

V.

יהללו את-שם יהוה  
כי-נשגב שמו לברו  
הודו על-ארץ ושמים  
וירם קרן לעמו  
תהלה לכל חסידיו  
לבני-ישראל עם קרבי

This is a Hallelujah Psalm indicated by its appended title הללויה. There can be no doubt that there is a division at the third strophe, where there is an antithesis between

הללו את-יהוה מן-השמים

and

הללו את-יהוה מן-הארץ

This would seem to divide the Psalm into two parts. There is, however, manifestly another strophe, beginning with

יהללו את-שם יהוה

This last strophe has but six lines. It therefore seems necessary to break the previous parts in two, if the strophes are to be uniform. Such a break is given in the first part by rising to the more general statement in the

הללוהו שמי השמים

and in the second part by passing over to the animal kingdom.

Furthermore, the last strophe is as closely related to the second part, as the second strophe is to the third part. For in the third line of the second strophe we have

יהללו את-שם יהוה

followed by the reason

כי-הוא צוה ונבראו

and it is evident that the first and second lines are in parallelism with them :

יהללו את-שם יהוה  
כי נשגב שמו לברו

Thus the Psalm is composed of two parts, with two strophes in the first and three in the second. It is of the nature of the hymn thus to swell in ascriptions of praise.

One modification of the text seems to be necessary. The second line of the Psalm is a dimeter if we read במרומים, but I can see no propriety in such a



dimeter here. It is probable that we should separate the **ב** and write it after the poetic style **בְּמוֹ** and so get the third beat of the accent.

4) We have an example of a strophe of seven lines in Psalm II. We shall give the two strophes of the first part:

## I.

למה רגשו גוים  
ולאמים יחגו ריק  
יתיצבו מלכי ארץ  
ורונוס נוסדו יחד  
על-יהוה ועל-משיחו  
ננתקה את מוסרותימו  
ונשליכה ממנו עבתימו

## II.

יושב בשמים ייִשחק  
ארני ילעג למו  
אז ידבר אלימו  
באפו ובחרונו יבהלמו  
ואני נסכתי מלכי  
על-ציון הר קדשי

The second strophe is here antithetical to the first strophe. This antithesis is complete, extending through every line but the fifth, which is omitted in the second strophe. It seems to us clear that the original poem has been mutilated by the omission of this line which ought to have given the **גוים ומלכי ארץ** as the antithesis to **על יהוה ועל-משיחו**. It would seem that this latter line is a dimeter in order to make a pause of a single beat before giving the words of rebellion. The Massoretes have incorrectly arranged the third and fourth lines of the second strophe by attaching **באפו** to the third line and thus making the fourth line a dimeter. There would be a sufficient reason for this if it was the original line preceding the words of Jehovah to the rebels, but this is probably not the case. Furthermore, the rhyme is preserved if we make the three lines close with **למו**, **אלימו**, and **מו**. The Hebrew poet is fond of rhyming through a few lines, as here; but he does not care to carry it on to any great length.

5) Psalm XLIX. gives us strophes of eight lines.

## I.

שמעו זאת כל-העמים  
האזינו כל-יִשְׁבֵי חֶלֶד

גם בני-אדם גם-בני-איש  
 יחד עשיר ואביון  
 פי ידבר חכמות  
 והגות לבי תבונות  
 אטה למשל אזני  
 אפתח בכנור חידתי

## II.

למה אירא בימי-רע  
 עון עקבי יסובני  
 הבטחים עלי חילם  
 וברב עשרם יתהללו  
 אח לא-פרה יפרה-איש  
 לא-יתן לאלהים כפרו  
 ויקר פדיון נפשם  
 וחדל לעולם

## III.

ויחי עוד לנצח  
 לא יראה השחת  
 כי-יראה חכמים ימותו  
 יחד-כסיל ובער יאברו  
 ועזבו לאחרים חילם  
 קרבם בתימו לעולם  
 משכנתם לדור ודור  
 קראו בשמותם על-אדמות  
 } ואדם ביקר בל-ילין  
 } נמשל כבהמות נדמו

Refrain.

## IV.

זה-דרכם כסל למו  
 ואחריהם בפיהם ירצו  
 כצאו לשאול ישתו  
 מות-ירעם וצורם לבלות  
 שאול מזבל לו  
 וירדו-בם ישרים לבקר



אך-אלהים יפרה נפשי  
מִדַּשְׁאֵל כִּי-יִקְחֵנִי

## V.

אל-תִּירָא כִּי-יַעֲשֶׂר אִישׁ  
כִּי-יִרְבֶּה כְּבוֹד בֵּיתוֹ  
כִּי-לֹא בָמוֹתוֹ יִקַּח-הַכֹּל  
לֹא-יִרְדַּךְ אַחֲרָיו כְּבוֹדוֹ  
כִּי-נִפְשׁוּ בַחֲיוֹ יִכְרֹךְ  
וַיִּוֹרֶךְ כִּי-תִשָּׁיב לֶךְ  
תָּבוֹא עַד-דֹּר אֲבוֹתָיו  
עַד-נֹצֵחַ לֹא-יִרְאוּ אוֹר

אִדָּם בִּיקָר וְלֹא-יִבִּין } Refrain.  
נִמְשַׁל כְּבָהֳמוֹת נִדְמוּ }

This Psalm is clearly divided into two parts by the refrain. The first part has an introductory strophe, and then two strophes that have in parallelism the two strophes of the second part. It is common not to distinguish these two strophes and to treat the poem as if it had an introductory strophe of eight lines, and then two long strophes, each with a refrain. But it is easy to divide the second part into two strophes of eight lines, and these correspond in length with the introductory strophe. There are but two difficulties. The former is the absence of the refrain. But this difficulty is met by the opinion that here, as elsewhere, the scribe has omitted the refrain from the intermediate strophes. The principal difficulty is in the connection between the first line of the third strophe and the last line of the second strophe: It is common so to connect them that there can be no break in the sense. We agree, however, with Hitzig and Graetz in the opinion that a new sentence begins with **וַיְהִי עוֹד**. Bickell attaches these two words to the previous line, so that it becomes **וַיְהִי-עוֹד לְעוֹלָם וַיְהִי-עוֹד** and the first line of the strophe begins with

לְנֹצֵחַ לֹא-יִרְאֶה הַשַּׁחַת

It seems to me that **וַיְהִי עוֹד** is the usual congratulatory wish, such as we found in Ps. xxii. 27, where, as here, the verb **אָמַר** is to be supplied. The clause

לֹא יִרְאֶה הַשַּׁחַת כִּי-יִרְאֶה

reminds us of Isaiah xxvi. 11, in its contrast,

בֶּל יַחְזִיזוּ יַחֲזוּ וַיִּבְשּׁוּ

The last line of the strophe is four-toned with **עָלִי**; we may reduce it by writing **עַל-אֲדָמוֹת**. However, Bickell thinks the text is corrupt and makes two lines

"שכחו אשר קראו  
בשמותם עלי אדמות

He is followed by Cheyne. In this way he gains the line that he loses above. It would suit our arrangement just as well. The second part is difficult in the third, fourth and fifth lines. These are variously arranged by critics. Hupfeld, Bickell, Cheyne, and others, transpose lines four and six. This is the easiest way of overcoming the difficulty.

6) We have an example of strophes of ten lines in the Penitential Psalm LI.

I.

חנני אלהים כחסרך  
כרב-רחמך מחה פשעי  
הרבה כבסני מעוני  
ומני חטאתי טהרני  
כי-פשעי אני אדע  
וחטאתי נגדי תמיד  
לך לבדך חטאתי  
והרע בעיניך עשיתי  
למען תצדק בדברך  
תזכה בשפטך

In this strophe we notice the constant recurrence of the ending in ' emphasizing in expression, as well as in the idea, the personal guilt of the Psalmist. In the ninth line we have an example of the attraction of **ברכרך** into an unusual grammatical form by the parallel **בשפטך**. The strophe ends with a dimeter, which is not uncommon. But there seems to be no good reason for a dimeter in line four. Therefore we separate the preposition from the noun and read **ומני** the archaic form of the preposition.

II.

הן בעוון חוללתי  
ובחטא יחמתני אמי  
הן-אמת חפצת בטחות  
ובסתם חכמה תודיעני  
תחטאני באזוב ואטהר  
תכבסני ומי שלג אלבין  
תשמיעני ששון ושמחה  
תגלנה עצמות רכית  
הסתר פניו מחטאי  
וכל עונתי מחה



## III.

לב-טהר ברא-לי אלהים  
 ורוח-נכון חדש בקרבי  
 אל תשליכני מלפניך  
 ורוח-קדשך אל-תקח ממני  
 חשיבה-לי ישון ישעך  
 ורוח נריבה תסמכני  
 אלמדה פשעים דרכיך  
 וחטאים אליך ישובו  
 הצילני מדמים אלהי-תשועתי  
 תרנן לשוני צדקתך

The second strophe is entirely plain. There is but one difficulty in the second strophe: **אלהים** makes the ninth line too long. It has been inserted by a later writer, probably from dittography.

## IV.

ארני שפתי תפתח  
 ופי יגיד תהלתך  
 כי לא-תחפץ זבח  
 ואתנה עולה לא-תרצה  
 זבחי אלהים רוח-נשברה  
 לב-נשבר ונרכה לא-תבזה  
 היטיבה ברצונך את-ציון  
 תבנה חומות ירושלם  
 אז-תחפץ זבח-צדק וכליל  
 אז-יעלו על-מזבחך פרים

This strophe has several difficulties in the Massoretic text. The rhythm is better if we attach **ואתנה** to the fourth line. The sixth line is too long if the divine name **אלהים** is retained. It is unnecessary. The poet would not have so lengthened his line without cause. The ninth line seems to have been enlarged by inserting **עולה** to explain the unusual **כליל** and make it correspond with line four. It is held by some that the last four lines are a later liturgical addition. But they are necessary to complete the strophe and are in entire accord with the rest of it. This theory of a later liturgical addition will not save the traditional theory expressed in the title that the Psalm is Davidic. Its doctrine is exilic, and the conclusion of the Psalm is in accordance with its historical situation.

7) Fine specimens of the strophes of twelve lines are given in that group of Psalms xc.-c. We shall give the one strophe of Psalm c.

הריעו ליהוה כל-הארץ  
עבדו את-יהוה בשמחה  
באו לפניו ברננה  
דעו כי-יהוה הוא אלהים  
הוא עשנו ולו אנחנו  
עמו וצאן מרעיתו  
באו שעריו בתורה  
באו חצרתיו בתהלה  
הודו-לו ברכו שמו  
כי טוב יהוה  
לעולם חסדו  
ועד-דור ודור אמונתו

The eighth line is a dimeter, the verb באו should be inserted to make it a trimeter. There is no good reason for a dimeter line here. It would be natural for a scribe to omit the second באו which he would think unnecessary to the sense. The tenth and eleventh lines are dimeters in order to metrical pauses at the close of the lines, in order that the trimeter might close the piece with the more vigor.

8) There are many Hebrew trimeters that have strophes of fourteen lines. We shall give as an example four strophes from the great poem of the origin and early fortunes of our race preserved in the narratives of the Jehovist in the earlier chapters of Genesis. The story of Cain and Abel is given in four strophes:

## I.

והאדם ידע אשתו  
ותהר ותלד את-קין  
ותאמר קניתי את-יהוה  
ותסוף ללדת את אחיו  
ותקרא שמו את הבל  
ויהי הבל רעה-צאן  
וקין-היה עבד אדמה  
ויהי מקץ ימים  
ויבא קין ליהוה  
מפרי האדמה מנחה



והבל הביא גם-הוא  
 מבכרות צאנו ומחלבהן  
 וישע אל-הבל ואל-מנחתו  
 ואל-קין ואל-מנחתו לא-שעה

The poem has been modified here and there by the Jehovist and the final redactor of the Pentateuch. But it is easy to trace his work and restore the poem to its original form. In the first line the editor has inserted the name **את חוה** as he did in the poem in the previous chapter. In the third line he has inserted **איש** in order, if possible, to prevent our taking **את יהוה** as the object of the verb. The style of this poem is to give the names of the children. Accordingly we insert the usual phrase **ותקרא שמו** in the fifth line. The poetic order requires us to transfer **ליהוה** from the end of the verse to the end of the previous line after **קין** in the ninth line. The editor has inserted **יהוה** in the thirteenth line. The parallelisms and the steady flow of the rhythm is manifest in the poem as we have given it above.

## II.

ויחר לקין מאד  
 ויפלו פניו  
 ויאמר יהוה אל-קין  
 למה חרה לי  
 ולמה נפלו פניו  
 הלא אס-תיטיב שאת  
 ואם לא תיטיב  
 לפתח חטאת רבץ  
 ואליך תשוקתו  
 ואתה תשמלו בו  
 ויאמר קין אל-הבל  
 נלכה אלי השרה  
 ויהי בהיותם בשרה  
 ויקם-קין אל-הבל ויהרגהו

There are but few editorial changes here. The LXX. and Samaritan codex and most critics justify the insertion of the twelfth line **נלכה אלי השרה**. The editor has inserted **אחי** in the last line to bring out more distinctly the idea of fratricide. There are two dimeters that seem to be designed, namely, in lines two and nine.

## III.

ויאמר יהוה אל-קין  
 אי הבל אחיך  
 ויאמר לא ידעתי  
 השמר אחי אנכי  
 ויאמר מה עשית  
 קול דמי אחיך  
 צעקים אלי מן-האדמה  
 ועתה ארור אתה  
 גרשתיך מן האדמה  
 אשר פצתה את-פיה  
 לקחת את-דמי-אחיך מידך  
 כי תעבד את-האדמה  
 לא-תסת תת-כחה לך  
 נע-ונר תהיה בארץ

The only editorial change in this strophe is the omission of גרשתיך in the ninth line. The use of it in the next strophe, line three, seems to require it here also.

## IV.

ויאמר קין אל-יהוה  
 גדול עוני מנשוא  
 הן-גרשת אתי היום  
 מעל פני האדמה  
 ומני פניך אסתר  
 והייתי נע-ונר בארץ  
 והיה כל-מצאי יהרגני  
 ויאמר לו יהוה  
 לכן כל-הרג קין  
 שבתים יקם  
 וישם לקין אות  
 לבלתי הכות אותו  
 ויצא מלפני יהוה  
 וישב בארץ נוד

In the fifth line it seems necessary to separate the preposition from the noun and write the archaic form מני. There is no reason for a dimeter here. The

tenth line is a natural dimeter. In the eleventh line it is better to strike out יהוה and in the thirteenth line קין as prosaic addition. It is not necessary to do this, because they may be combined with the verbs by Maqqeph, but it seems better to do so.

Thus, with a very few easy modifications that have been caused by editorial work, where the poetical character of the piece was lost sight of, the original poem stands before us with all its original beauty and power.

We have given a sufficient number of examples to illustrate the strophical organization of the trimeter poems. There are strophes of longer lines in the Psalter and the prophets, and in the historical books. The song of Moses, Deut. xxxii., is composed of three parts, and the scheme of the strophes in these parts is 12, 10, 10, 15, | 12, 10, 10, 10, | 10, 12, 15, 10, with a refrain of four lines. Proverbs viii.-ix. have the scheme 10, 12, 10, 10, | 10, 12, 10, | 12, 12, 12. Job. iii. has the scheme 20, 18, 14; Job. xxxi. has the scheme 8, 9, 8, 6, 6, 10, 10, 8, 12, 6. Job. xxxviii.-ix. has the scheme 8, 8, 8, | 6, 6, 6, 6, | 6, 6, 4, 6, | 7, 8, 8, | 8, 12, | 15, 10.

Psalm xlv. gives us an example of a bridal song in which the first strophe is six lines with its refrain, the second twelve lines with its refrain, and the third, twenty-four lines with its refrain.

Psalm lxxx. gives us two strophes of eight lines, the third strophe of sixteen lines, and the fourth strophe of eight lines. The third strophe has been doubled to embrace the allegory of the vine, and has a double refrain on that account.

We shall conclude with a specimen of responsive trimeters—Psalm xxiv. 1-6.

## CHORUS.

לִיהוֹה הָאָרֶץ וּמְלוֹאָהּ  
תָּבֵל וַיֵּשְׁבִי בָּהּ  
כִּי־הוּא עַל־יָמִים יִסְדָּהּ  
וְעַל נְהָרוֹת יִכּוֹנְנָהּ

## QUESTION.

מִי־עֵלָה בַּהֵר יְהוֹה  
וּמִי־יָקוּם בַּמָּקוֹם קִדְּשׁוֹ

## RESPONSE.

נָקִי כַפַּיִם וּבֶרֶךְ לֵבָב  
לֹא־נִשְׂא לִישׁוֹא נַפְשׁוֹ  
וְלֹא נִשְׁבַּע לַמְרָמָהּ



יֵשׁא בִּרְכָה מֵאֵת־יְהוָה  
וְצִדְקָה מֵאֱלֹהֵי יִשְׁעוֹ

CHORUS.

זֶה דּוֹר דִּרְשׁוֹ  
מִבְקֵשֵׁי פִנִּיךָ יְעֻקֵּב

The **אֵשׁ** should be stricken out in second line of the response. Another specimen of such songs is found in xxiv. 7-10. See also Hosea xiv., Isaiah lxiii. 1-6, and Psalm xx. ✓

These examples will be sufficient to illustrate the great variety of strophical organization that we find in Hebrew trimeter poems. In our next article we shall give some specimens of tetrameter poems. —

INSCRIPTION OF NEBUCHADNEZZAR, VARIANTS OF AN  
UNPUBLISHED DUPLICATE OF THE NEW  
YORK CYLINDER.

BY J. F. X. O'CONOR, S. J.,

Woodstock College, Md.

Through the kindness of the assistant of the British Museum and of my learned confrère, J. N. Strassmaier, I have been enabled to secure for the readers of the New York inscription, the text of an unpublished duplicate of this cylinder of Nebuchadnezzar, which was brought to light by the publication of the New York original in the Metropolitan Museum of Art.

The value of the first text as published, becomes enhanced by this corroboration of its general accuracy, though differing in some minor points, especially where the original was partly indistinct. This new copy of the text, besides confirming the substantial correctness of the first translation, supplies us with a number of variants that will be of interest and value, to the students of the first text who wish to become familiar with this peculiarity of the Babylonian scribes.

The first publication supplied three styles of writing, which give a useful table for the study of variations between Assyrian and early and late Babylonian characters. The present notes indicate in one inscription several instances of variants in the Babylonian text itself. The text of this new cylinder of the British Museum, is the same as that published in my pamphlet, in January, 1885, but the division of lines is quite different, as well as many of the characters, as will be seen from the accompanying plate, and the following parallelism. In both cylinders there are the same number of lines, one hundred. In the duplicate of the British Museum, column I. continues as far as line 35 inclusive; in the New York cylinder, column I. continues as far as line 28, a difference of eight lines. Column II. in each ends at line 70. On the British Museum cylinder, lines 47 and 48 are represented by one line. It is the reverse for lines 76, 77. These two lines of the British Museum cylinder are represented by one line on the New York cylinder. Lines 92, 93, and lines 97, 98 are also represented by one line on the cylinder of New York.

## DIVISION OF LINES

## BRITISH MUSEUM (unpublished).

## NEW YORK CYLINDER (O'Connor).

## Col. I.

## Col. II.

Line 29 is seven lines from the beginning of Column II.

Line 29 is precisely the beginning of Column II.

30. a-na ma-na-ma  
31. šarru ma-aḥ-ri-im

30. a-na ma-na-ma šarri ma-aḥ-ri-im  
31. la im-gu-ur-ma

## Col. II.

36. a-na e-bi-eš eš-ri-e-ti  
37. li-ib-bu-am  
38. ti-is-mu-ur-ma  
39. i-na ši-ga-ti  
40. u-sa-ap-pa ša-aš-ši  
44. ni-iš ga-ti-ia  
45. im-ḥu-ur-ma  
47. } one line.  
48. }

36. a-na e-bi-eš eš-ri-e-ti  
37. li-ib-ba  
38. u-ga-ru am-ša-as-si (?)  
39. aš-ši ga-ti ....  
40. u-sa-ap-pa ša-aš-ši (?)  
44. ni-iš ga-ti-ia im-ḥu-ur-ma  
47. e-bi-eš biti ša il Šamaš  
48. il Šamaš il Ramanu u il Marduk

## Col. III.

## Col. III.

71. li-bi-it ga-ti-ia šu-ku-nu  
75. i-na ki-bi-ti-ka  
76. ki-it-ti lu-uš-ba-a  
77. li-it-tu-ti  
78. ba-la-tam u-ûm ru-ku-ti  
79. ku-un kussî  
80. lu-ši-ri-ik-tu-um-ma ri-'u-a  
81. a-na da-er-a-ti  
92. i-ša-ri-iš  
93. a-pa-la-an-ni  
94. i-na a-ma-ti-ka  
95. el-li-ti  
96. šu la šu-pi-e-su  
97. lu-ti-bu-u  
98. lu-za-ak-tu

71. li-bi-it ga-ti-ia šu-ul-bi-ir  
75. i-na ki-bi-ti-ka ki-it-ti  
76. lu-uš-ba-' li-it-tu-ti  
77. ba-la-tam ana û-um ru-ku-ti  
78. ku-un kussî lu-si-ri-ik-tu-um-ma  
79. li-ri-ku li-iš-ša-li-bu  
80. ri-'u-u a-na da-ra-a-ti  
92. i-ša-ri-is a-pa-la-an-ni  
.....  
93. ina a-ma-ti-ka  
94. ša-li-mu  
95. ša la (ma bi-e-ri) uttakaru  
97. lu-ti-bu-u lu-za-ak-tu  
98.

For the rest the division of lines is the same.



## OTHER INSCRIPTIONS OF NEBUCHADNEZZAR.

The name of Nebuchadnezzar has been handed down to us, not only in the Sacred Writings, and in early profane history, but especially and with peculiar interest in the cuneiform inscriptions.

The records of this king, however, confine themselves, for the most part, to descriptions of edifices erected or restored by him; and not one document has yet been brought to light which may be termed strictly historical; none that recount his military expeditions or conquests, as we find so abundantly with regard to the Assyrian Kings Tiglath-pileser, Sennacherib and Assurbanipal. It may be that future excavations will reveal such a monument, but up to the present, there has been a remarkable contrast in this regard between the Babylonian and Assyrian documents.

Those who have been interested, hitherto, in one or other of these texts, will be pleased, no doubt, with an enumeration, complete, as far as known, of the previously published texts.

The inscriptions of Nebuchadnezzar already edited, independently of recent ones, are thirteen in number. They are familiar to many readers of Assyrian, not so to others. They vary in length and importance from the seal of the king, bearing simply his title, to the standard inscription including over six hundred lines. This last is usually known as the East India House Inscription. It was published in I R., and has been translated and commented upon by various authors.<sup>1</sup>

In recording the inscriptions we begin with the smallest.

No. I.—This is a seal containing the profile of the king, with the inscription, “Nebuchadnezzar, King of Babylon, to Merodach, his Lord; he made it for his own life.” This cameo is preserved in the Berlin Museum. It was published by Schenkel in his *Bibel-lexicon*, and in the monthly journal of the Academy of Science, Berlin.

II.—Among the inscriptions found by Smith in Babylon, one is inscribed on the pupil of the eye of a statue of the god Nebo,<sup>2</sup> “To the God Nebo, his Lord, Nebuchadnezzar, King of Babylon, son of Nabopolassar, King of Babylon, for his preservation he made.”

III.—Three contract tablets, discovered by Smith, bearing the date of the reign of Nebuchadnezzar:

1) City of Babylon, month of Tammuz, 15th day, 20th year of Nebuchadnezzar, King of Babylon.

2) City of Babylon, month of Iyyar, 21st day, 37th year of Nebuchadnezzar, King of Babylon.

<sup>1</sup> See Smith's *Assyrian Discoveries*, Rawlinson, Schrader, Menant, Lenormant, Budge, Fleming, Brunengo, etc.

<sup>2</sup> Smith's *Assyrian Discoveries*, p. 385.

3) City of Babylon, month of Kisleu, 8th day, 37th year of Nebuchadnezzar, King of Babylon.

These are of special interest on account of the dates.

IV.—Numberless bricks with the inscription "I am Nebuchadnezzar, King of Babylon, restorer of the Temple of Saggil and the temple of Zida, oldest son of Nabopolassar, am I"—(Menant, Schrader).

V.—The epigraphs of Larsam (Senkereh), and Mugheir (Ur), which, in addition to the preceding inscription, add that this king restored the temple of the Sun at Larsam, and of the Moon at Ur.

VI.—On the side of a brick was found a record of the palace of the great king. This inscription begins like No. IV, and continues thus: "I built a palace for the sojourn of my majesty in the city of Babylon, situated in the land of Babylon. And I dug foundations to a great depth, below the water of the river, and wrote there the record on cylinders, covered with bitumen and brick. With thy aid, I, Merodach, God of the gods, I built this palace in the heart of Babylon. Come and dwell there, multiply its progeny, and make the people of Babylon, by my hand, victorious forever." On the gate of one of the palaces of Babylon is the short inscription, "Palace of Nebuchadnezzar, King of Babylon, restorer of the temple Saggil and Zida, constant in the adoration of Nebo and Merodach, son of Nabopolassar, King of Babylon."

VII.—Among the ampler inscriptions is that of the temple of Zarpanit (My-litta) of which there are four copies, two in the Berlin Museum and two in the Bibliothèque Nationale, Paris: "I am Nebuchadnezzar, King of Babylon, son of Nabopolassar, King of Babylon, I.—

"I founded, I built the august temple, the temple of Zarpanit in the midst of Babylon, in honor of Zarpanit, the august sovereign, within the limits of Babylon. I had built of brick and bitumen a square sanctuary. I dug the arches of its niches in the depth of the earth.

"O Sovereign of the gods, august mother, be propitious to me, my work is perfected with thy assistance. Favor the increase of families, watch over the mothers at the time of bringing forth, thou who presidest over the birth of children."<sup>1</sup>

VIII.—Similar in style, but longer, is the inscription of Senkereh or Larsam. After the usual titles and salutations to the god, the king recounts his building the temple of the Sun in the City of Larsa.

It ends with the invocation, "O Sun, great God, bless thy offering in its beginning and end, the temple of the Sun, the glorious work of my hands. By thy help, give me a happy life for long years, the permanency of my throne, and the victory of my arms. May the arches, porticoes, the columns of the temple of the Sun, my glorious works, make perpetual remembrance of me in thy sight."

<sup>1</sup> Menant, *Babylon and Chaldea*, p. 215.

IX.—As at Larsam, so at Sippara (Abu Habba), there was a temple of the Sun, Eparra, which had fallen to ruin. This Nebuchadnezzar restored, and left a record of it on the recently discovered cylinder, now in the Metropolitan Museum of Art. It has been named the New York cylinder, in contradistinction to the cylinder of Senkereh, and to the duplicate of the same text in the British Museum. The variants of the British Museum duplicate cylinder are given in the plate in parallel lines with the New York original.

X.—Among inscriptions of greater length is the famous inscription of Bor sippa, where Nebuchadnezzar built the great temple Bît Zida to Nebo.

XI.—Next in order comes a cylinder of the British Museum, in two columns of thirty lines each. It describes the defences of Babylon (Menant, *Babylon et la chaldée*).

XII.—The cylinder of Sir Thomas Phillips, similar to the preceding, with the additional enumeration of the building and restoration of temples in other Chaldean cities, at Cutha, Sippara, Larsam, Ur, Nipur, Uruk, in honor of Nergal, Šamaš, Sin, Anu and Ištar.

This inscription of 170 lines is in three columns, in the cursive cuneiform. It was published first by Grotefend, in 1848, and then by Sir Henry Rawlinson in I R., 65-66. This, with the exception of the following, is the largest of the inscriptions.

XIII.—This, perhaps the best known of the inscriptions, has been named the Standard Inscription. It is inscribed on a block of black basalt, one meter high, ten centimeters wide. It includes ten columns with 619 lines of writing in archaic characters. For a long time it remained in the museum of the East India Company, and hence it is sometimes called the East India Inscription. Sir John Hartfoot was the first to translate it, and later it was published with modern transcription by Sir Henry Rawlinson in the I R., 56-64. Oppert read the entire translation to the Academy of Rhiems, Nov. 3, 1865. A complete version was given by Menant, and subsequently by Lenormant, Rawlinson, and in 1883, a transcription with translation and commentary was published by Flemming.

This list includes the earlier published inscriptions of Nebuchadnezzar. The number of cuneiform cylinders is not large; but the vast multitude of contract tablets of the time of Nebuchadnezzar, Nabonidus, Neriglissar, Cambyzes, Cyrus and Darius, not yet translated, but pregnant with knowledge of those times, leave a useful task for the lover of Assyrian.

The writer acknowledges the generous welcome extended by the Assyriologists of America and Europe to the first translation and publication in America of a Babylonian original.



New York Cylinder (O'Connor)

- 1 Wabû-ku-du
- 3 Ga-aš-ru ša-aš-tu
- 13 ū bit xi-
- 15 Ša Wabû-aplu-u-
- 16 Šarru a-na-ku
- 23 u ud-di-ū e-ri-e-ti-šu
- 23 Šu-ma si-ra-am
- 27 Ša u-ul-la-mu-a
- 33 e-mu-u
- 31 la im-gu-u-ma
- 33 a-ši
- 34 e-im-ku mu-ut
- 36 ana e-bi-eš
- 37 li-ib-ba
- 38 aš-ši
- 39 aš-ši ga-ti
- 40 u-ša-ap-ja ša-aš-ši
- 43 u-um ana muu in-um-ma
- 45 iš-ša-a su-pi-e-a
- 45 same as l. 47.
- 49 ip-u-us-ma
- 52 an-nun xi-i-nun
- 57 ša ša-me-e u in-si-ti
- 61 pu-u-us xi-it-ti
- 63 bit-
- 64 ša xi-i-ib
- 69 a-na bit Šarra bit-ku
- 70 i-na eri-bi-ja
- 71 li-bi-it ga-ti-ia
- 72 xi-ni-iš na-ap-li-is-ma
- 76 lu-ūš-ba li-ib-tu-ti
- 77 ba-la
- 78 ku-un xussi li-ši-i-in-tu ma
- 79 li-i-ku li-iš li-bu
- 80 i-i-u a-na
- 84 mu-ša-li-im
- 85 lu-i-ba šar-u-ti-ia
- 89 um-ma-ni-ia
- 91 ina di-i-nun u bi
- 94
- 95 ša-la
- 100

British Museum (unpublished)

- 1 Wabû-ku-du
- 2 ša-aš-tu
- 13 ū bit xi-
- 15 ša Wabû-aplu-u-
- 16 Šarru a-na-ku
- 22
- 23
- 27 ša u-ul-la-ma
- 28 e-mu-u
- 31 la im-
- 33 ia-si
- 34 e-im-ku mu-ut mu-u
- 36 ana e-bi-eš
- 37 li-ib-ba-am
- 38 u-ga-a-am ša-aš-ši
- 39
- 40
- 42
- 45 su-pi-e-a
- 47
- 49
- 52
- 57 ša ša- ū in-si-
- 61 pu-u- xi-it-ti
- 63 bit- bit Šar-ra
- 64 ša xi-i-ib
- 69 a-na bit Šar-ra bit-ku
- 70 di-iš
- 71 li-bi-it ga-ti-ia
- 72 xi-ni-iš na-ap-li-
- 76 lu-ūš-ba- -it-tu-ti
- 77 ba-la
- 78 ku-un xussi di-i-in-tu
- 79 li- ku li-iš
- 80 da-er-a-ti
- 84 mu-ša-li-im
- 85 ut-ti-ia
- 89 lu-u-lu um-ma-ni-
- 91 i-na di-i-nun u bi
- 94
- 95 ša-la
- 100 li-mi-e



## JEWISH GRAMMARIANS OF THE MIDDLE AGES.

BY PROF. MORRIS JASTROW, JR., PH. D.,

University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pa.

---

### III.

Is it altogether an accident that, as a general thing, we know very little, frequently nothing, about the lives of great men? It cannot be said that this applies only to such as lived in very remote times; for many instances in quite modern periods may be cited,—Shakspeare being perhaps the most prominent,—of eminent men, even such as had gained renown during their life-time, concerning whom we are in profound ignorance. Besides, hero-worship was surely as strong in antiquity as to-day, if not indeed, as there is every reason to suppose, stronger; and people no doubt observed eagerly the doings and noted the sayings of those whom they regarded with awe and reverence, or even looked upon as superior beings. Eminent minds in all probability were in every age surrounded by Boswells and Eckermanns, who watched the object of their worship. “Wie er räuspert und wie er spuckt.” And while they may not have committed their observations to writing on stone, clay, wax, papyrus or parchment, still there was oral tradition; and it is yet a question whether memory, untrustworthy as it is in transmitting *exact* knowledge, is not as capable of ensuring *permanence* to events as the stylus, pencil, quill, or even printing-press. We to this day remember what we are told better and much longer than what we read; and how much more so was this the case at a time when the average memory was so much stronger because so much more needed. A more satisfactory explanation of this rather curious phenomenon that we know so little about those who are best known seems to be that the personalities of great men are overshadowed by their achievements; the man is lost in the hero, the father in the scholar, the neighbor in the writer. But however this may be, the fact remains that, of some of the greatest productions of the human mind, not even the authors are known. Almost all of the Old Testament is anonymous; for the fanciful and crude conjectures of a later age in parceling out the authorship of the various books among certain personages are rejected to-day by most critics as utterly without foundation and incongruous. Of the writer of the Iliad nothing is known, and by many the very personage of Homer is regarded as mythical. Who wrote the Vedas? the Zend-avesta? the Nibelungen? The fact that the question has been asked “Who wrote Shakspeare?” must at all events be taken as an evidence of uncertain and defective knowledge concerning him.



Saadia ben Joseph, or as he is more commonly known, Saadia Gaon, by virtue of his position as head of the Rabbinical Academy at Sura, a man who left an indelible impress upon his age, forms no exception to the rule. We know but very few of the facts of his life. He was born in Fayum; but the exact year of his birth has not been ascertained. The date ordinarily assumed, 942, can scarcely be correct, and it is safer to place it between 870 and 875. More than half of his life he spent in his native place, though it is not known in what capacity. His energetic opposition to Karaism brought him into prominence and secured for him the honor of being chosen head of the school in Sura. This was in the year 928. A controversy with the "Resh Galutha" (Prince of the Exile) the highest dignitary of the Babylonian Jews, cost him his position, and he retired into private life for a period of about five years. He utilized his seclusion by writing the work on which his chief claim to immortal fame rests, the "*Kitab al-Amânât w'al-Itikâdât*," i. e., Book of Faith and Knowledge, or as we might say in modern phraseology, Religion and Science, which, as its title shows, is a treatise of religious philosophy. It is the first attempt, as far as we know, at harmonizing the faith of Judaism with reason. Apart from the intrinsic merits of the work, the fact itself that such a book was written is significant for the period in which Saadia Gaon lived. Necessity, no doubt, called it forth; and its appearance is a signal proof of the mental activity of the times. While upholding Rabbinism in all its essential particulars, Saadia's treatise is characterized by a spirit of free inquiry. He is as violent against those who shun the light of reason from being shed on religion as against those who reject rabbinical tradition. His philosophy is naturally quite crude, his reasoning anything but deep, and at times very shallow, his arguments frequently childish; but no one can fail to be impressed with his broad spirit and his great sincerity. The book is of course written with a purpose,—namely, to crush Karaism; and while it did not accomplish this, there can be no doubt that Saadia was instrumental in checking the progress of Karaism, which at one time threatened to assume large dimensions. The rebellious spirit against the tyrannical sway of Talmudical authority was abroad, and the new movement had a most important result in bringing about a reconstruction of the old party. This was due, in a great measure, to Saadia, who fought his opponents with their own weapons and met them on their own territory. Opposition to Karaism was no doubt a prominent factor also in his numerous grammatical and exegetical works. Unfortunately almost all of the former and most of the latter have become lost; and it is only through numerous quotations in later writers that we learn the nature of their contents. The great fertility of his mind is best seen by the large list of his publications, as follows:—

1. *Kitâb al-lugât* (Book of Speech).
2. *Kitâb al-Daghesh w'al-Rafê* (Book of Daghesh and Rafê).
3. A treatise on the Vowel and Massoretic Points.

4. On the Gutturals.

5. *Sefer Sachoth* (Book of Elegance), no doubt of a grammatical character.

6. *Tafsir el-Sabîna lufsât el-farâd*, i. e., Explanation of seventy ἀπαξ λεγόμενα in the Old Testament.

7. *Sefer Hâ-Igarôn* (Book of Gathering), probably a collection of difficult words occurring in the Old Testament.

Besides these, there is to be mentioned his famous translation of large parts of the Bible into Arabic, accompanied by copious commentaries. Some scholars are, indeed, of the opinion that Saadia made a complete translation of the Bible. But there is no positive evidence for the fact. It is probable that such was his intention, but that he did not live long enough to carry it out. The parts extant comprise the Pentateuch, Isaiah, Psalms, Proverbs and Job. Owing to the loss of his grammatical works, it is rather difficult to form an accurate picture of his method, and we are left to reconstruct it chiefly from the general traits of his commentaries on the biblical books, and secondly, as already intimated, from quotations in such writers as Menachem ben Saruk, Donash ben Librat, Ibn Ġanach, Ibn Ezra, Rashi and Kamchi. There is one feature which deserves special mention. He did not confine himself, in his explanation of the Bible, to the Hebrew of the Bible, but frequently sought the aid of the language of the Mishna and the Gemara, besides—and not rarely—the Arabic. In his little treatise on the seventy words occurring but once in the Old Testament, this trait is especially noticeable. More than half of these ἀπαξ λεγόμενα are brought into connection with some words of the Gemara.

From the high terms in which he is invariably spoken of when quoted, it is clear that he must have stood in high repute even when many of his views and much of his method had become antiquated. A grammarian of the generation following upon Saadia consecrated an entire treatise to a review of Saadia's commentaries and grammatical treatises, in which, while exposing a large number of errors, he nevertheless speaks in terms of the highest respect for his important achievements.

The great defect in Saadia's grammatical method consists in his ignorance of the functions and peculiarities of the so-called vowel-letters, Waw, Yodh, He, when present in stems. Here he is all at sea; and while Donash corrects many of his errors, he, as little as Saadia, is able to bring about a systematic presentation of the subject. It will be shown later on how, by a single stroke, Abu Zakarija Hajjuġ put an end to the confusion prevailing with regard to the so-called weak stems. Saadia is thus led to make some very childish mistakes. In the passage *Exod. ii. 5*, he takes the word אִמְתָּה as "her elbow," instead of "her maid," confounding אִמְתָּה with אִמָּה. The stem of מִשְׁתָּאָה (*Gen. xxiv. 21*) he supposes to be שְׁתָּה, and renders, accordingly, "demand a draught." His weakness is also apparent in a neglect of nice distinctions. So

in Num. xxiv. 6, he takes אֶהְיֶה as though identical with אֱהְיֶה. Again, מַאֲרוֹת (Isa. xxvii. 11) he derives from אַרְה, instead of אֹר; again, נַעֲתֵם (Isa. ix. 18) from נֹע, instead of עַתֵם. He stumbles over the difficult אֲרֵרָה (Isa. xxxviii. 15) in regarding it as a derivative from נָרַר. But for all that, Saadia shows himself far superior to his cotemporary, Jehuda Ibn Koreish. He is no longer satisfied with merely guessing and conjecturing, but attempts to frame his investigations within a system. He has already very clear ideas of the distinction between the letters that form the stem and those that merely serve the purposes of modifying the same. The mere titles of his grammatical treatises show that he proceeded systematically, and had already divided the subject of Hebrew grammar into certain divisions.

But even more than his purely grammatical works, did his translation of the Bible, with commentaries, contribute towards arousing a great interest in grammatical studies among the Rabbinites. The next generation already boasts of a large number who devote themselves, almost to the exclusion of the Talmud, to Hebrew grammar; and what is more remarkable still, different *schools* soon make their appearance. With Saadia, the revival of the study of the Bible among the Jews may be said to have fully begun.



## NOTES ON מְבוּל, נְפִילִים, ETC.

BY REV. PROF. T. K. CHEYNE, D. D.,

Oriel Professor of the Interpretation of Holy Scripture in Oxford University, England.

1. Ps. XXIX. 10, מְבוּל. Gen. VI. 4; Num. XIII. 33, נְפִילִים.

There are five possible renderings of Ps. XXIX. 10:

(a) Yahwe sat at the Flood, and Yahwe sitteth on as a king forever; i. e. (as Driver expresses it, *Hebrew Tenses*, § 79), “from that moment went on and continues sitting” (to account for the Imperfect with strong Waw).

(b) Yahwe sat (enthroned) at the flood; therefore [consequently] Yahwe sitteth as king forever; i. e., the fact that Yahwe controlled the flood, produced by rain-storm and swollen torrents, increases the Psalmist’s faith in the general truth of His government of the world.

(c) Yahwe sat (enthroned) for the flood (to produce the storm-flood), etc. Cf. IX. 8, “Yahwe shall be seated forever; he hath prepared his throne *for judgment*.”

(d) Yahwe sat (enthroned) on the flood, and Yahwe sitteth on as king forever (i. e., continueth his royal rule from the time when he erected his throne on the created heavenly ocean. These waters above the firmament were already referred to in verse 3 (cf. Gen. I. 6, 7; Am. IX. 6; Ps. CIV. 3). For the construction cf. יֹשְׁבֵת לְכֶסֶּא, IX. 5.

As to (a), an abrupt reference to the Deluge, in this fine descriptive poem, seems improbable. Remember too that this is the only place where מְבוּל occurs outside the Book of Genesis, and that Noah himself is very rarely mentioned except in that book (see Isa. LIV. 9; Ezek. XIV. 14). Until, therefore, some very cogent reason shall be given for the capital letter in the Revised Version’s “Flood,” I ask leave to reject it. Against (b) and (c) it may be urged that no mention of a rain-storm occurs in the foregoing description. One may be surprised at this. It is otherwise in the fine description of a storm in the Mu’allaga of Imra-al-Kais (see Lyall’s translation, *Ancient Arabian Poetry*, p. 103), which in other points is strikingly parallel to the Hebrew poem. But one can neither venture to suppose that a stanza has dropped out of the latter, nor yet that there is an abrupt reference to a phenomenon which the description has ignored. Against (d) is the preposition, which does not harmonize with the construction in verse 3; besides, the construction seems too condensed (“sitteth on the flood” = “sitteth in his upper chambers, which are on the flood”), and it is too bold an assumption that מְבוּל = מַיִם, simply on the ground of Gen. VI. 6, וְהַמְּבוּל הָיָה מַיִם עַל-הָאָרֶץ.

I venture to propose a fifth explanation, viz., that מְבוּל means not “flood,” but “destruction,” and so “destructive storm.” I accept Friedrich Delitzsch’s

view,<sup>1</sup> that מְבוֹל is connected with Assyrian nabâlu to destroy, from which comes nabalu, nabal destruction or wasting (Esarhaddon, *Annals*, col. 2, 26, milic nabali a journey of desert-land<sup>2</sup>). I would also ask if nabbâltu, rendered by Delitzsch "the wasting storm-flood," would not be more precisely rendered without "flood." Our passage may, then, it would seem, be translated,—

In the wasting storm Yahwe sat enthroned;  
Therefore (āpa) Yahwe sitteth as king forever.

I make no reference to Arabic wablun and wa'bilun heavy rain (cf. *Kuran*, Sura II. 266, 267, and *Hamasa*, p. 611, with Freytag's note), as these must be connected with another root.

It remains to account for the enigmatical נְפִילִים. Dillmann (on Gen. VI. 4) inclines to Tuch's view, who renders הַנְּפִילִים "the heroes," strictly "the extraordinary ones," connecting with the root פִּלָּה, פָּלָא, to which נָפַל stands in the same relation as נָבַל to בָּלָה. So too Lenormant, *Les origines*, vol. I., ed. 1, p. 344; Schrader, KAT., ed. 2, p. 99. The former gives evidence for the fact that Assyrian naplu is equivalent to the Akkadian ušu-gal unique in greatness, but not for the existence of an Assyrian root palâ. Schrader, therefore, in a supplementary note (KAT., p. 609), points out that Lenormant's naplu must be the same as nablu destruction (epithet of Tiglath-pileser). I see that the late Edward Norris, in his *Assyrian Dictionary*, quotes naplu; but obviously he might just as well have transcribed nablu (see Sayce, *Syllabary*, 168); so that we cannot say that there were two forms of the root in Assyrian. Still there may have been in early Hebrew; נָפַל and נָבַל would co-exist, like פָּוַר and בִּזָּר, if, that is, we think it necessary to assume that מְבוֹל and נְפִילִים ever had a living connection with Hebrew at all, and were not simply loan-words, derived at different times, and perhaps by different channels, from Assyrian tradition. At any rate, it seems to me but little less probable that הַנְּפִילִים means the "destruction" than that מְבוֹל signifies "destructive storm."

2. Eccles. XII. 1. In *Job and Solomon* (London, 1886), pp. 225, 226, 300, I have ventured, with unfeigned reluctance, to abandon the reading which both Authorized Version and Revised Version translate "Remember thy Creator" (Professor Briggs, "thy great Creator"). Besides Prov. v. 15-18, I might have adduced a passage from the Mu'allaga of Zuhair, rendered thus by Mr. Lyall,—

Who holds not his foe away from his cistern with sword and spear,  
It is broken and spoiled, etc.

Mr. Lyall adds, "The cistern is a man's home and family and whatever he holds dear." Some readers might perhaps have been conciliated had I adopted Mr. Lyall's wider interpretation of the "cistern." The purity and beauty of Jewish family life is well known, and the figure in an oriental poem most appropriate.

<sup>1</sup> *Wo lag das Paradies*, p. 156. Cf. Haupt, in Schrader's *Die Keilinschriften und das Alte Testament*, ed. 2, p. 66, n. 3.

<sup>2</sup> Budge, *History of Esarhaddon*, p. 59.

SOME CORRECTIONS TO THE TEXTS OF CYLINDERS A AND  
B OF THE ESARHADDON INSCRIPTIONS AS PUB-  
LISHED IN I R., 45-47, AND III R., 15, 16.

BY ROBERT F. HARPER, PH. D.,

New Haven, Conn.

The inscriptions of Esarhaddon were first published in Layard's *Inscriptions in the Cuneiform Character from Assyrian Monuments*, 1851. Cylinder A is given on pages 20-29 under the title "On an Hexagonal Cylinder," and B on pages 54-58 under the title "On lower half of an Hexagonal Object of Baked Clay." The text of this edition is of no value for critical study. It is, however, as good as could have been expected at that time. The text of A appeared later in I R., 45-47. This edition is vastly superior to that of Layard, and can, in general, be depended on. Cylinder B appeared again in III R., 15, 16, edited by George Smith. This edition is not as trustworthy as that of A in I R., on account of the extremely bad condition of the original of B. The texts of A and portions of B, with transliteration and translation, were published for the last time by Ernest A. Budge, in his *History of Esarhaddon*, London, 1880. Budge's edition of these texts is untrustworthy. As it appeared as late as 1880, and "after a careful (?) collation of all the principal texts," it has been received by many as an authority. One need only compare it with the originals to see that this is not the case. Cf. Delitzsch's review in the *Literarisches Centralblatt*, May 21, 1881. Paul Haupt, on the other hand (*vid. HEBRAICA*, I., p. 229), says: "Since Mr. Budge's laborious work has been censured beyond measure, I take pleasure in being able to state that I consider *The History of Esarhaddon* fully as good as George Smith's *History of Assurbanipal* and the *History of Sennacherib* by the same scholar." Even if this were true, one must take into consideration that Smith's *Assurbanipal* was published in 1871, and Budge's *Esarhaddon* in 1880. Haupt's comparison, however, is unjust to Smith and does little credit to Budge's book.

In the summer of 1885, while studying in the British Museum, I collated A and B, and copied C.<sup>1</sup> This collation forms the basis of the corrections which I have to offer to the texts as published by Rawlinson, Smith, and Budge.

In conclusion, I wish to express my indebtedness to Mr. Theo. G. Pinches, of the British Museum, both for his kindness in helping me while at work in the Museum, and especially for the collations of several difficult passages contained in a letter of Jan. 24, '87. I am also under very many obligations to my highly honored teacher, Professor Friedrich Delitzsch, for the assistance which he has rendered me.



<sup>1</sup> The text of Cylinder C (heretofore unpublished), as copied by me from the original in the British Museum, will be printed from photo-engraved plates in the July number of *HEBRAICA*.







the two characters us-ri at the end I see ~~no~~ perhaps traces  
of Ṭṣ-ri (ana naḥal). Compare with this, Cyl. C. II., 7 where I read  
~~Ṭṣ-ri~~ Ṭṣ-ri. Cf. also K. 3086, K. 3082, S. 2027. As a result of these  
comparisons, I am inclined to read: [ša ina itē] naḥal ~~muṣ-ri~~  
Muṣri, or, perhaps [Ṭṣ-ri] ~~muṣ-ri~~. "Pinches!!"

A. II. 1. This line is entirely broken away on the orig. I could not distinguish any signs whatever. Pinches (letter of Jan. 24/87) writes: Here I can only see ~~the~~ with a few dents where 2 or 3 characters have been. Iārkēsu has probably been taken from a duplicate fragt. "Q. for Iārkēsu Cyl. C. II, 8, ~~the~~ 𐎠𐎡𐎢𐎣𐎤𐎥𐎦𐎧𐎨𐎩𐎪𐎫𐎬𐎭𐎮𐎯𐎰𐎱𐎲𐎳𐎴𐎵𐎶𐎷𐎸𐎹𐎺𐎻𐎼𐎽𐎾𐎿𐏀𐏁𐏂𐏃𐏄𐏅𐏆𐏇𐏈𐏉𐏊𐏋𐏌𐏍𐏎𐏏𐏐𐏑𐏒𐏓𐏔𐏕𐏖𐏗𐏘𐏙𐏚𐏛𐏜𐏝𐏞𐏟𐏠𐏡𐏢𐏣𐏤𐏥𐏦𐏧𐏨𐏩𐏪𐏫𐏬𐏭𐏮𐏯𐏰𐏱𐏲𐏳𐏴𐏵𐏶𐏷𐏸𐏹𐏺𐏻𐏼𐏽𐏾𐏿𐐀𐐁𐐂𐐃𐐄𐐅𐐆𐐇𐐈𐐉𐐊𐐋𐐌𐐍𐐎𐐏𐐐𐐑𐐒𐐓𐐔𐐕𐐖𐐗𐐘𐐙𐐚𐐛𐐜𐐝𐐞𐐟𐐠𐐡𐐢𐐣𐐤𐐥𐐦𐐧𐐨𐐩𐐪𐐫𐐬𐐭𐐮𐐯𐐰𐐱𐐲𐐳𐐴𐐵𐐶𐐷𐐸𐐹𐐺𐐻𐐼𐐽𐐾𐐿𐑀𐑁𐑂𐑃𐑄𐑅𐑆𐑇𐑈𐑉𐑊𐑋𐑌𐑍𐑎𐑏𐑐𐑑𐑒𐑓𐑔𐑕𐑖𐑗𐑘𐑙𐑚𐑛𐑜𐑝𐑞𐑟𐑠𐑡𐑢𐑣𐑤𐑥𐑦𐑧𐑨𐑩𐑪𐑫𐑬𐑭𐑮𐑯𐑰𐑱𐑲𐑳𐑴𐑵𐑶𐑷𐑸𐑹𐑺𐑻𐑼𐑽𐑾𐑿𐒀𐒁𐒂𐒃𐒄𐒅𐒆𐒇𐒈𐒉𐒊𐒋𐒌𐒍𐒎𐒏𐒐𐒑𐒒𐒓𐒔𐒕𐒖𐒗𐒘𐒙𐒚𐒛𐒜𐒝𐒞𐒟𐒠𐒡𐒢𐒣𐒤𐒥𐒦𐒧𐒨𐒩𐒪𐒫𐒬𐒭𐒮𐒯𐒰𐒱𐒲𐒳𐒴𐒵𐒶𐒷𐒸𐒹𐒺𐒻𐒼𐒽𐒾𐒿𐓀𐓁𐓂𐓃𐓄𐓅𐓆𐓇𐓈𐓉𐓊𐓋𐓌𐓍𐓎𐓏𐓐𐓑𐓒𐓓𐓔𐓕𐓖𐓗𐓘𐓙𐓚𐓛𐓜𐓝𐓞𐓟𐓠𐓡𐓢𐓣𐓤𐓥𐓦𐓧𐓨𐓩𐓪𐓫𐓬𐓭𐓮𐓯𐓰𐓱𐓲𐓳𐓴𐓵𐓶𐓷𐓸𐓹𐓺𐓻𐓼𐓽𐓾𐓿𐔀𐔁𐔂𐔃𐔄𐔅𐔆𐔇𐔈𐔉𐔊𐔋𐔌𐔍𐔎𐔏𐔐𐔑𐔒𐔓𐔔𐔕𐔖𐔗𐔘𐔙𐔚𐔛𐔜𐔝𐔞𐔟𐔠𐔡𐔢𐔣𐔤𐔥𐔦𐔧𐔨𐔩𐔪𐔫𐔬𐔭𐔮𐔯𐔰𐔱𐔲𐔳𐔴𐔵𐔶𐔷𐔸𐔹𐔺𐔻𐔼𐔽𐔾𐔿𐕀𐕁𐕂𐕃𐕄𐕅𐕆𐕇𐕈𐕉𐕊𐕋𐕌𐕍𐕎𐕏𐕐𐕑𐕒𐕓𐕔𐕕𐕖𐕗𐕘𐕙𐕚𐕛𐕜𐕝𐕞𐕟𐕠𐕡𐕢𐕣𐕤𐕥𐕦𐕧𐕨𐕩𐕪𐕫𐕬𐕭𐕮𐕯𐕰𐕱𐕲𐕳𐕴𐕵𐕶𐕷𐕸𐕹𐕺𐕻𐕼𐕽𐕾𐕿𐖀𐖁𐖂𐖃𐖄𐖅𐖆𐖇𐖈𐖉𐖊𐖋𐖌𐖍𐖎𐖏𐖐𐖑𐖒𐖓𐖔𐖕𐖖𐖗𐖘𐖙𐖚𐖛𐖜𐖝𐖞𐖟𐖠𐖡𐖢𐖣𐖤𐖥𐖦𐖧𐖨𐖩𐖪𐖫𐖬𐖭𐖮𐖯𐖰𐖱𐖲𐖳𐖴𐖵𐖶𐖷𐖸𐖹𐖺𐖻𐖼𐖽𐖾𐖿𐗀𐗁𐗂𐗃𐗄𐗅𐗆𐗇𐗈𐗉𐗊𐗋𐗌𐗍𐗎𐗏𐗐𐗑𐗒𐗓𐗔𐗕𐗖𐗗𐗘𐗙𐗚𐗛𐗜𐗝𐗞𐗟𐗠𐗡𐗢𐗣𐗤𐗥𐗦𐗧𐗨𐗩𐗪𐗫𐗬𐗭𐗮𐗯𐗰𐗱𐗲𐗳𐗴𐗵𐗶𐗷𐗸𐗹𐗺𐗻𐗼𐗽𐗾𐗿𐘀𐘁𐘂𐘃𐘄𐘅𐘆𐘇𐘈𐘉𐘊𐘋𐘌𐘍𐘎𐘏𐘐𐘑𐘒𐘓𐘔𐘕𐘖𐘗𐘘𐘙𐘚𐘛𐘜𐘝𐘞𐘟𐘠𐘡𐘢𐘣𐘤𐘥𐘦𐘧𐘨𐘩𐘪𐘫𐘬𐘭𐘮𐘯𐘰𐘱𐘲𐘳𐘴𐘵𐘶𐘷𐘸𐘹𐘺𐘻𐘼𐘽𐘾𐘿𐙀𐙁𐙂𐙃𐙄𐙅𐙆𐙇𐙈𐙉𐙊𐙋𐙌𐙍𐙎𐙏𐙐𐙑𐙒𐙓𐙔𐙕𐙖𐙗𐙘𐙙𐙚𐙛𐙜𐙝𐙞𐙟𐙠𐙡𐙢𐙣𐙤𐙥𐙦𐙧𐙨𐙩𐙪𐙫𐙬𐙭𐙮𐙯𐙰𐙱𐙲𐙳𐙴𐙵𐙶𐙷𐙸𐙹𐙺𐙻𐙼𐙽𐙾𐙿𐚀𐚁𐚂𐚃𐚄𐚅𐚆𐚇𐚈𐚉𐚊𐚋𐚌𐚍𐚎𐚏𐚐𐚑𐚒𐚓𐚔𐚕𐚖𐚗𐚘𐚙𐚚𐚛𐚜𐚝𐚞𐚟𐚠𐚡𐚢𐚣𐚤𐚥𐚦𐚧𐚨𐚩𐚪𐚫𐚬𐚭𐚮𐚯𐚰𐚱𐚲𐚳𐚴𐚵𐚶𐚷𐚸𐚹𐚺𐚻𐚼𐚽𐚾𐚿𐛀𐛁𐛂𐛃𐛄𐛅𐛆𐛇𐛈𐛉𐛊𐛋𐛌𐛍𐛎𐛏𐛐𐛑𐛒𐛓𐛔𐛕𐛖𐛗𐛘𐛙𐛚𐛛𐛜𐛝𐛞𐛟𐛠𐛡𐛢𐛣𐛤𐛥𐛦𐛧𐛨𐛩𐛪𐛫𐛬𐛭𐛮𐛯𐛰𐛱𐛲𐛳𐛴𐛵𐛶𐛷𐛸𐛹𐛺𐛻𐛼𐛽𐛾𐛿𐜀𐜁𐜂𐜃𐜄𐜅𐜆𐜇𐜈𐜉𐜊𐜋𐜌𐜍𐜎𐜏𐜐𐜑𐜒𐜓𐜔𐜕𐜖𐜗𐜘𐜙𐜚𐜛𐜜𐜝𐜞𐜟𐜠𐜡𐜢𐜣𐜤𐜥𐜦𐜧𐜨𐜩𐜪𐜫𐜬𐜭𐜮𐜯𐜰𐜱𐜲𐜳𐜴𐜵𐜶𐜷𐜸𐜹𐜺𐜻𐜼𐜽𐜾𐜿𐝀𐝁𐝂𐝃𐝄𐝅𐝆𐝇𐝈𐝉𐝊𐝋𐝌𐝍𐝎𐝏𐝐𐝑𐝒𐝓𐝔𐝕𐝖𐝗𐝘𐝙𐝚𐝛𐝜𐝝𐝞𐝟𐝠𐝡𐝢𐝣𐝤𐝥𐝦𐝧𐝨𐝩𐝪𐝫𐝬𐝭𐝮𐝯𐝰𐝱𐝲𐝳𐝴𐝵𐝶𐝷𐝸𐝹𐝺𐝻𐝼𐝽𐝾𐝿𐞀𐞁𐞂𐞃

A. II 3. The text in I. R. 45, II, 3, viz. , etc. (cf. also, Norris, Dict. 229, 505) is correct. Budge's reading (HE)  is entirely wrong. Vid. Haupt's Wächter-ben-Nagael, Hebraica, I., 229.

A II. 4. Insert after  the sign  $\angle$ , which can be seen very plainly on the orig. After the  $\angle$  some other sign was written and afterwards erased by the scribe. It looks as if the scribe had first written  $\angle$   and, afterwards, scratched off all but the  $\angle$ . Budge naturally passes the line without comment.

A. II., 10. (4) (so Rawlinson, Layard and Budge) is not on any of the three cylinders.

A. II, 10. Read ki-~~di~~-di instead of ki-~~di~~-di.

A. II, 17. Read ~~ⲡ~~ instead of ~~ⲧ~~. The latter really stands on the orig., but must be regarded as a mistake of the scribe himself. Cyl. B. III, 9 and Cyl. C. II, 20 both have ~~ⲡ~~. Budge (H.E.) reads ~~ⲡ~~ without comment, as if it were on the original.

A.II., 23. The text in I.R. is correct. Budge attempts to correct the published text by reading asibu-<sup>17</sup>.

A. II, 44. Read ka-mu-u.















B. VI., 24. Read ~~144~~<sup>(2)</sup> instead of ~~14~~ (so Pinches)

## ➤CONTRIBUTED NOTES.◀

**Neubauer's Etymologies.**—It is a cause for regret that men of large scholarship and profound thought will, at times, lend themselves to the promulgation of ideas, built upon airy bases, the utter weakness of which their own knowledge should be the means of discovering. What applies to this class of men may also hold good when referring to those who employ Procrustean methods in the interpretation of the Bible, whether in a religious, historical, or geographical sense, to suit certain original views of their own—so original that, if advanced by the untutored, or the novice, they would excite derision.

I was recently perusing a short article by Dr. Adolph Neubauer, of Oxford, published in the *London Notes and Queries*, of January 29, 1887. Therein I found statements which (though I bow with respect to the man whose literary attainments have earned for him a deservedly wide reputation) forced a smile, that soon changed to a feeling not at all akin to humor. That so eminent a Hebraist should assert that "Jeremiah, as it is known, came over to Ireland, married an Irish princess, and brought over a copy of the Law, which is now buried in the Mount Tara (from *Thorah*, 'the Law')," must surely cause one's eyes to open in amazement. Who is the Irish historian that has made so important a discovery? And as for *Tara* having any meaning in common with *Thorah*, I would like to learn upon what authority Dr. Neubauer maintains it. Perhaps even stranger are other arguments aiming to prove an ancient settlement of Jews in the United Kingdom, as, for example, "Edinburgh" being derived from "Eden" (what about the termination?), "Eboracum" (or "York"), from "Eber" or "Ebrac" (can this be related to "Abrech"?), and "London" from "Lan-Dan," which Dr. Neubauer renders "the dwelling of Dan," but for which term, as a compound, he will find no support in the sacred text. The translation of "Lan," as "the dwelling," I am at a loss to understand, since "Lun" or "Lin" to lodge (or rather, to remain temporarily) does not convey the idea of permanence, as he attempts to show. Nor does the word "lan," occurring in Gen. XXXII. 22, have any other signification than that of "lodged."

But Dr. Neubauer ventures still further when he claims that "old London was, therefore, inhabited by the Danites (perhaps, a part of them went over to Denmark, although not yet claimed by the Danes)." What do students think of such an argument? Again, the Oxford Librarian writes, "the Guildhall may have been the lepers' house, connected with the Hebrew word גִּלְדָּר (Job xvi. 15);" and "in the name of Dublin is most likely to be found a reversed form, that name seeming to be *Dublan*, the dwelling of *Dub* or *Dob*. This word, which means, usually, in Hebrew, a bear, could dialectically mean a wolf (hardened from *Zeeb*). The wolf represents the tribe of Benjamin (Gen. XLIX. 27), consequently a part of the Benjaminites settled in Dublin," etc. Apart from the point regarding the affinity of *Dob* and *Zeeb* (which may be possible, though it seems remote), what weight attaches to the main statements? In a more recent article, "The Anglo-Israel Mania," of Feb. 12th, he writes: "Not only from names of



towns can I prove the settlement of Israelitish tribes in the United Kingdom, but also from family names. So, for instance, would I suppose that the name of Labouchere is nothing else but Hebrew לוֹשֶׁר = Lavusar (in softened form) = the Prince of Levi. Will not this bring over to my 'craze' *Truth*, which has done me the honor of noticing my recent communication to 'N and I?'"

HENRY S. MORAIS,  
Philadelphia, Pa.

**Syriac and Assyrian.**—At the last meeting of the Oriental Society (see *Proceedings*, 1886, p. xxv) my friend, Professor Jastrow, of the University of Pennsylvania, opened up a new field of research for us in showing the affinities between Samaritan and Assyrian. If I put in a plea here for the Syriac, both as regards the Assyrian and the Samaritan, it is because, in these studies, this language has been unnecessarily neglected. Of all the Aramean dialects, the Syriac of Edessa ('Urhâi) and Nisibis (N<sup>e</sup>šibhîn, Šôbhâ) is the one which has played the greatest part in history. Its vocabulary is therefore the most extended; and in studying Samaritan, our first recourse must of necessity be to the Syriac, to see whether a word is not of general Aramaic use. For instance, the stem ŠLM, as Professor Jastrow (p. xxvi) correctly shows, has the meaning "die" in Assyrian and Samaritan. The Syriac, however, has this meaning as well. Good old Castell (ed. Michaelis, p. 916) had already cited Mark xv. 37 [39]; 2 Macc. vii. 7, 13 (ed. Lagarde, p. 230). Trost adds Luke xxiii. 46. See also Wright, *Contrib. to Apoc. Lit. of N. T.*, 56:4, Šelmath naphšê. The Syriac shows the same development, "complete, end," as the Assyrian. So also the Jewish Aramaic. Levy, TW., II., 487.<sup>1</sup> The Samaritan translation for Š<sup>e</sup>bhu'âthî, Gen. xxiv. 8, אָמִי, is merely the Syriac î mi, î mâ, Payne Smith, col. 1602; Jewish Aramaic, יָמָא, Levy, TW., II., 335. For the similarity of the verbs פָּ"א and פָּ"י see Nöldeke, *Mandäische Gram.*, § 179 (and note), ZDMG., XXII., 500. ŠLK cut open, tear open has the same meaning in B'khôrôth, 45a (Levy, TW., II., 490). For the Arabic see Lane, I., p. 1410 seq. As regards the MS. reading of Gen. xix. 29, see Kohn in ZDMG., XXXIX., 220. In the same manner the meaning "fight" does not attach to the stem KRB in Assyrian and Samaritan only. For the 'Aph'el in Syriac "bellavit" see the passages in Cast.-Mich., p. 825. "Contendere," with 'am, 'Aprêm, II., 32 E (cf. Ethiopic takarba bellavit). Likewise k<sup>e</sup>râbhâ (not kârbâ, as in Cast.) bellum; makr<sup>e</sup>bhânê bellatores, 'Aprêm, III., xxix; k<sup>e</sup>rabhthânâ bellicos, Land, III., 211:12; Josephus, 15:5, etc. Jewish Aram. k<sup>e</sup>râbhâ, Levy, II., 385. Samaritan מְרַנֵּע comes from a form akin to the Syr. madhn'hâ: אַדְלָה is the Syriac 'adh lâ.

For the derivation of אָרַשׁ from רָאֵשׁ, Professor Jastrow has the support of Castell in his *Heptaglott Lexicon*, p. 237, where he compares Samar. אָרַשׁ with Heb. רָאֵשִׁית "per metath." For the Samar. telim and the Assyr. talimu, see Smith's *Chaldäische Genesis*, trans. by Delitzsch, p. 272, n. 1. On תְּלִימוֹ = אָחוּ, Gen. xli. 2, see Löw, *Aramäische Pflanzennamen*, p. 42, who cites Geiger, ZDMG., XVI., 732.

RICHARD J. H. GOTTHEIL,  
Columbia College.

<sup>1</sup> According to Wahrmond, *Handbuch der Arab. u. Deut. Sprache*, I., 920, the Arabic تَسْلِم arrives at a similar meaning in a different way: "du bist glücklich davon gekommen, d. h. der nach welchem du fragst ist gestorben."

## ➤BOOK ❖ NOTICES.❖

### VATKE'S OLD TESTAMENT INTRODUCTION.\*

In 1835, Wilhelm Vatke published his *Religion des Alten Testaments*, one of the first works in which was broached the theory now known by the name of Graf, Kuenen or Wellhausen. This maiden effort was so saturated with Hegelian philosophy as to be almost incomprehensible to the uninitiated, and Prof. Reuss himself holding the same theory of the Pentateuch, confesses that he was unable to read the book. On account, possibly, of the cold reception met by this work, Vatke gave up authorship almost altogether, and although he continued to lecture in Berlin until his death (1882), he published very little. We now receive from one of his pupils his lectures on "Old Testament Introduction."

A comparison with the earlier work shows some remarkable changes. The Hegelian terminology which makes the earlier work almost unreadable has disappeared. The style is now clear and simple. A transcendental philosophy nowhere shows itself. We have the common sense almost commonplace view of things which we expect to find in a work of this kind. The author begins with a definition and a brief history of the science. He then takes up general introduction, treating first of the people of Israel and the Semites in general. A second chapter treats the Hebrew language; a third, the Hebrew alphabet. The canon and text are then taken up including the history of the printed text. A history of Old Testament exposition concludes this first part. The special introduction takes up the books in their usual order. About forty pages at the end are given to the Apocrypha.

I have said the transcendental philosophy of the earlier work nowhere shows itself. This statement must be modified so far as to admit the following statement which is purely speculative. "The Hebrew principle first stepped into life by prophets as organs of revelation. The earlier theological order of stand-points in the Old Testament which put the law first, the prophetic order next, is to be exactly reversed. The first stand-point of revelation *can be only* the prophetic, while all legal definitions, and the objective view involved in them, embody an application of the already existing principle to the actual world." This is, to be sure, a serious matter, and lays the author open to the charge freely made against his earlier book, that it is constructed *a priori*. But this is the only instance in which the principle is distinctly avowed in the present work.

The point at which the most interest will be manifested, is probably the treatment of the Pentateuch. As has been said, Vatke was one of the first to put the document known as A or Q—the first Elohist—not *earlier* than the captivity. We find, with some surprise, not only that he places his document earlier

\* WILHELM VATKE'S HISTORISCH-KRITISCHE EINLEITUNG IN DAS ALTE TESTAMENT. Nach Vorlesungen herausgegeben von Dr. Hermann G. S. Preiss, mit einem Vorwort von Dr. A. Hilgenfeld. Bonn, 1886. 8vo, pp. xviii, 754.



in point of time than Deuteronomy, but that he holds to a new order of the documents. Dillmann, who uses the signs A B C D, supposes this order to represent the relative age of the documents. Wellhausen makes the chronology B C D A, while Vatke now comes in and asserts that it is C A B D. He adds, however, that the time of composition of the three earliest probably falls within the same half century (which he makes to be from 720 to 670 B. C.). One of the supposed surest data for determining the age of Deuteronomy, has been the Book of the Law in the Temple in the time of Josiah. This Book of the Law has been almost uniformly identified with Deuteronomy. Vatke now declares this to be an error, and asserts that *that* book was a composite of the three older documents, while Deuteronomy was not composed till the last decade of the kingdom of Judah (p. 387).

Beyond this, there is little which calls for special remark in the book. The author shows some acquaintance with American literature (p. 266). We are accustomed in such works to more or less ingenious and baseless hypotheses; as that the name יהוה was originally ייחה, or that Ps. LXXII. and Isa. XIX. 16-25 refer to the time of Ptolemy II. These, however, are sparingly used. The author leaves us Moses, believes him, indeed, to be the author of the Decalogue, therefore a monotheist who made religion bear upon the moral life of the people. He supposes the Decalogue to have been given in a briefer form than the present text.

We have found occasional inaccuracies or infelicities of expression. Is it true that all the Semitic dialects have the same method of constructing sentences—that their syntax is similar, in other words? (p. 178). Bleek-Wellhausen does not put Joel under Jeroboam II. (*Wellhausen* the name is spelled here, and we have noticed several similar errors, due of course to the proof-reader). The literature is generally brought down to a quite recent date. As Abulwalid's lexicon is mentioned as having been made known by Gesenius and others, it would be well to add that it was published by Neubauer. DeBiberstein Kazimirski appears as Kazimirski de Biberstein. Ugolino's Thesaurus is in thirty-four (not fifty-four) volumes. It is said that Zebulon (instead of Simeon) is not mentioned in Deut. XXXIII.

But it is a thankless task to be making minor criticisms. Accuracy is doubtless more difficult to obtain in a posthumous work than in one which the author himself is permitted to see through the press.

H. P. SMITH,  
Cincinnati, Ohio.

#### S. A. SMITH'S KEILSCHRIFTTEXTE ASURBANIPALS.\*

This volume contains a transliteration of the Asurbanipal text (V R., 1-10), a translation of the same into German, some notes by the author, a few notes by Mr. Pinches, and a vocabulary. For students of Assyrian there is great need of carefully edited texts, with grammatical and philological notes. Such transliter-

\* DIE KEILSCHRIFTTEXTE ASURBANIPALS, KÖNIGS VON ASSYRIEN (668-626 v. Chr.) nach dem selbst in London copirten Grundtext mit Transcription, Uebersetzung, Kommentar und vollständigem Glossar von Samuel Alden Smith. Heft I. Die Annalen nach dem Cylinder R<sup>m</sup> 1. (Vgl. V R. 1-10). Leipzig: Verlag von Eduard Pfeiffer, 1887.



## HEBRAICA.

ations, wherever possible, should be accompanied by the cuneiform text. The work of Lotz (*Tiglathpilesar*), Pognon (*Bavian*), Lyon (*Sargontexte*), in this line, is known even to those who have but begun the study. It is greatly to be regretted that the work of Mr. Smith is not in all respects so reliable as that of his predecessors. One must infer that the work has been done too rapidly. There may have been circumstances, beyond the control of Mr. Smith, which have compelled this haste. For the sake of those who need such help as is here offered, it is certainly unfortunate.

In the transliteration there is a sad lack of uniformity. Not to speak of the typographical errors, which are very numerous, and the omissions, which occur too frequently, there are so many cases of inconsistency (at least a hundred or so) as to bewilder a beginner. Among many others, the following forms are used indiscriminately: kîbit and kibit, kirîb and kirib, šâdu and šadû, êli and êlî, âhu and ahu, âbu and abû. If one reads ê-mêd, why not also ê-pêš, ê-rêb, ê-kêm, etc. Wrong transliterations are not infrequent, as ħaršânu for ħuršânu, Bêl-ba-ša for Bêl-ikîša; etc. Why should he read palah for the Participle of palâhu, instead of paliḥ.

The translation in some places does not accord with the transliteration, there being occasionally what seem to be mistakes as to the precise grammatical form of the Assyrian word. In the vocabulary, words are not in all cases classified under the roots to which they properly belong; still there is ample room here for difference of opinion. The notes are not what either the student or the scholar would have liked. They are too few and too fragmentary for the former; too elementary for the latter. The notes of Mr. Pinches are most excellent. One can only regret their small number.

The zeal of Mr. Smith in his Assyrian labors is most commendable. It is gratifying to know that Americans are not neglecting this important branch of Semitic study. In such work, however, there is needed great care. With the careful work of Schrader, Delitzsch, Haupt, Pinches, Lyon, and others, before us, work even slightly imperfect suffers by comparison. In the succeeding volumes, it is to be hoped that Mr. Smith will not feel himself so hurried.

WILLIAM R. HARPER,  
New Haven, Conn.



## ◀SEMITIC BIBLIOGRAPHY.▶

- AMIAUD, A. Cyrus, roi de Perse: Mélanges Renier. Paris: Vieweg, '86. Pp. 241-260.
- et MECHINEAU, L. Tableau comparé des écritures babylonienne et assyrienne archaïques et modernes avec classement des signes d'après leur forme archaïque. Paris: E. Leroux, '87. 8vo, xvi, 148.
- BERTIN, GEORGE. Thé Babylonian Zodiac. *Academy*, Jan. 22, '87.
- BEZOLD, C. Mittheilungen aus Wien. *Ztschr. f. Assy.*, Nov., '86.
- BOSCAWEN, W. ST. CHAD. Babylonian Teraphim. *Bab. and Orient. Rec.*, Jan., '87.
- A Babylonian Land Grant. *Ibid.*, March, '87.
- BROWN, ROBERT. Babylonian Astronomy in the West.—The Aries of Aratos. *Ibid.*, Jan., '87.
- The Babylonian Zodiac. *Academy*, Jan. 29, '87.
- BUDGE, E. A. W. The Book of the Bee. *Anecdota Oxoniensa.* (Semitic Series, vol. I., pt. II.) *Athenæum*, Jan. 8, '87.
- CLERCQ, L. DE, and J. MENANT. Collection de Clercq; Antiquités Assyriennes. *Amer. Journal of Archæology* (A. L. Frothingham, Jr.), Dec., '86.
- DELITZSCH, FRIEDRICH. Kleinere assyriologische Notizen. I. Assy. kultaru, "Zelt;" babyl. kuštaru? *Ztschr. f. Assy.*, Nov., '86.
- Prolegomena eines neuen hebräisch-aramäischen Wörterbuchs zum Alten Testament. *Ibid.* (Schrader).
- HABERLANDT, M. Assyrisch-babylonische Alterthümer. *Annalen des k. k. naturhistorischen Hofmuseums.* Band I., '86.
- HALEVY, J. L'étoile nommée kakkab mesri en assyrien. *Journ. asiatique*, VIII., '86.
- HOFFMANN, GEORG. Namen und Sachen. *Ztschr. f. Assy.*, Jan., '87.
- HOWARD, N. Alttestamentliche Geschichtserzählung und Assyrische Keilschriften.....M.5.
- JENSEN, P. Bemerkungen zu einigen sumerisch u. assyrischen Verwandtschaftswörtern. *Ztschr. f. Assy.*, Nov., '86.
- Hymnen auf das Wiedererscheinen der drei grossen Lichtgötter. I. *Ibid.*, Jan., '87.
- Napāhu, u. s. w. *Ibid.*, Nov., '86.
- LACOUPERIE, TERRIEN DE. The Sinim of Isaiah not the Chinese. *Bab. and Orient. Rec.*, Jan., '87.
- Did Cyrus introduce Writing into India? *Ibid.*, Feb., '87.
- LAGARDE, PAUL DE. On a Syriac MS. belonging to the collection of Archbishop Ussher. *Gött. gel. Anzeigen*, No. 1.
- LEHMAN, C. F. Zwei Erlasse König Asurbanabal's. *Ztschr. f. Assy.*, Jan., '87.
- LYNN, W. T. Note on Babylonian Astronomy. *Bab. and Orient. Rec.*, March, '87.
- MAHLER, ED. Zur Chronologie der Babylonier. *Ztschr. f. Assy.*, Nov., '86.



- MASSAROLI, G. Essai d'interpretation assyro-chaldéenne. *Le Museon*, '86, pp. 610-620.
- MENANT, J. L'expédition Wolfe en Mésopotamie. *Revue archeol.*, VIII., '86.
- MEYER, ED. Ausgrabungen in Babylonien. *Deutsche Rundschau*, XIII., 4, '87.
- MUELLER, E. Grammatische Bemerkungen zu den Annalen Asurnasirpal's. *Ztschr. f. Assy.*, Nov., '86.
- MUELLER, D. H. Die Keil-Inschrift von Aschrut-Darga, entdeckt und beschrieben von Prof. Joseph Wunsch, publicirt und erklärt. *Ibid.* (Oppert), Jan., '87.
- NOELDEKE, TH. Mene tekcl upharsin. *Ibid.*, Nov., '86.
- OPPERT, J. Quelques explications complémentaires aux formules juridiques. *Ibid.*, Nov., '86.
- Mul kaksidi, l'étoile de direction et non Antarès. *Ibid.*
- L'olive de Gudéa. *Ibid.*
- PEISER, F. E. Ein Satz in den Beschwörungsformeln. *Ibid.*, Jan., '87.
- PINCHES, THEO. G. The Babylonians and Assyrians as Maritime Nations. 1. An Assyrian Letter anent the transport by ship of stone for a winged bull and colossus. *Bab. and Orient. Rec.*, Jan., '87.
- A Fragment of a Babylonian Tithe-List. *Ibid.*, March, '87.
- Babylonian Notes:—I. Gaddaš, an early Babylonian King. II. Tarzîa, "King of Babylon and Countries." III. The Deities Ilan and Hur. *Ibid.*, Feb., '87.
- Additional Note on King Gaddaš. *Ibid.*
- REBER, FRZ. Ueber altchaldäische Kunst. III. *Ztschr. f. Assy.*, Jan., '87.
- SAYCE, A. H. The Hittite Boss of Tarkondêmos. *Ibid.*, Nov., '86.
- WAI., II., 28. Col. I., 13-15. *Ibid.*, Jan., '87.
- SMITH, S. A. Two unedited Texts, K 6 and K 7. *Ibid.*, Nov., '86.
- STRASSMAIER, J. N. Zwei babylonische Verträge aus der Zeit von Nabonid. *Ibid.*, Jan., '87.
- TELONI, B. Varia. V. *Ibid.*, Jan., '87.
- Aiuti offerti dai monumenti di Ninive e di Babilonia per lo studio dell'Antico Testamento. Firenze, '86. 8vo, pp. 22.
- TIELE, C. P. De Hooftempel van Babel en die van Borsippa (naar de opschriften van Nebukadrezar). *Verslagen en Mededeelingen der Koninklijke Akademie van Wetenschappen*, Afdeeling "Letterkunde." 3de Reeks, Deel. III. Amsterdam, '86.
- TYLER, THOMAS. The Babylonian Idea of a Disembodied Soul. *Bab. and Orient. Rec.*, Feb., '87.
- WINCKLER, H. Ueber einem Nebukadnezarcylinder des Berliner Museums. *Ztschr. f. Assy.*, Nov., '86.
- Ein text Nabopolassars. *Ibid.*, Jan., '87.